



**FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE**

JPRS Report

Soviet Union

Political Affairs

SOVIET COMMENTARY ON THE 19TH PARTY CONFERENCE

REPRODUCED BY
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
SPRINGFIELD, VA 22161

19980812 106

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 1

10
87
A45

Soviet Union

Political Affairs

SOVIET COMMENTARY ON THE 19TH PARTY CONFERENCE

JPRS-UPA-88-036

CONTENTS

31 AUGUST 1988

RETURNING DELEGATES' IMPRESSIONS

Estonian Delegate Describes Work of Conference Commissions [G. Rozenshteyn; SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 7 Jul 88]	1
Uzbek Obkom Chief Interviewed on Conference Impressions [S.M. Mamarasulov; PRAVDA VOSTOKA, 7 Jul 88]	3
Guards Officer Views Party Conference Achievements [Sh. Bashenov; KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 7 Jul 88]	6
Returning Estonian Delegates Hold Press Conference [R. Amos, P. Raydla; SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 8 Jul 88]	8
Estonia's Saul Views Republic's Contribution to Conference [B.E. Saul; SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 8 Jul 88]	11
Estonian Journalist Comments on Conference Discussion of Press [P. Raydla; SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 8 Jul 88]	14
Lithuania's Songayla, Returning Delegates Speak at Party Meeting [R. Songayla, et al; SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 9 Jul 88]	15
Shcherbitskiy Addresses Returning Conference Delegates [RATAU; PRAVDA UKRAINY, 9 Jul 88]	21
Young Conference Delegate Considers Future Career in Politics [Yu. Surkov; IZVESTIYA, 12 Jul 88]	23
Conference Delegates Discuss New Tasks For Primary Party Bodies [PRAVDA, 13 Jul 88]	26
Moscow Obkom Chief Interviewed on Aftermath of Conference [PRAVDA, 28 Jul 88]	32

LETTERS ON CONFERENCE

SOVETSKAYA KULTURA Readers React to Conference Speeches, Resolutions [G. Terekhova; SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 7 Jul 88]	36
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Readers Air Views on Conference Decisions [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 8 Jul 88]	36
Izvestiya Runs Readers' Letters on Party Conference [IZVESTIYA, 17 Jul 88]	38
PRAVDA Surveys Readers' Letters after Conference [V. Grishin; PRAVDA, 3 Aug 88]	41

DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGAL REFORM

RSFSR Justice Minister Interviewed on Reform of Courts [G. Orlovskiy; SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 13 Jul 88]	44
Head of Political Science Research Center Writes on 'Legal State' [M. Piskotin; SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 14 Jul 88]	46
Jurist Examines Proposal to Combine Party, Soviet Posts [B. Kurashvili; IZVESTIYA, 22 Jul 88]	50
Jurist Discusses Conference Decision on Legal Reform [B. Kurashvili; IZVESTIYA, 28 Jul 88]	52
Criminal Investigation Official Views Resolution on Legal Reform [M. Kozhyevnikov; SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 29 Jul 88]	55
Justice Minister Interviewed on Legal Reform Resolution [B.V. Kravtsov; SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 31 Jul 88]	56

POST-CONFERENCE EDITORIALS

PRAVDA Carries Editorial on Conference Resolutions [PRAVDA, 6 Jul 88]	59
PRAVDA Carries Editorial on Democratization Resolution [PRAVDA, 7 Jul 88]	61
IZVESTIYA Runs Editorial on Post-Conference Political Reform [IZVESTIYA, 7 Jul 88]	63
PRAVDA Carries Editorial on Antibureaucracy Resolution [PRAVDA, 8 Jul 88]	64
IZVESTIYA Editorializes on Party Role in Reform [IZVESTIYA, 8 Jul 88]	66
PRAVDA Editorial Views Resolution on Ethnic Relations [PRAVDA, 9 Jul 88]	68
IZVESTIYA Editorial Views Expanding Democratic Process [IZVESTIYA, 9 Jul 88]	70
PRAVDA Carries Editorial on Glasnost Resolution [PRAVDA, 11 Jul 88]	71
PRAVDA Editorial Considers Resolution on Legal Reform [PRAVDA, 12 Jul 88]	73

IZVESTIYA Editorial Examines Interethnic Ties [IZVESTIYA, 12 Jul 88]	75
IZVESTIYA Editorial Considers New Role of Soviets [IZVESTIYA, 13 Jul 88]	77
IZVESTIYA Editorial Considers Resolution on Glasnost [IZVESTIYA, 14 Jul 88]	78
IZVESTIYA Editorializes on Struggle Against Bureaucracy [IZVESTIYA, 15 Jul 88]	80
IZVESTIYA Considers Concept of State Based on Law [IZVESTIYA, 16 Jul 88]	82

Estonian Delegate Describes Work of Conference Commissions

*18000618 Tallin SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA
in Russian 7 Jul 88 p 2*

[Article by G. Rozenshteyn, under the rubric: "The 19th All-Union CPSU Conference Delegates Speak:" "To Drive Out Stagnation"]

[Text] What was the atmosphere like at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses? What unexpected things happened? What were your strongest impressions? Boris Moronov, an automatic lathe machine adjuster at the "TEZ imeni M.I. Kalinin" Association, answers these and other questions asked by SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA.

First, there were several unexpected things. Before the conference, there was much talk of reducing the number of delegates to the Supreme Soviet chambers, of converting the deputies into professional politicians, and so forth. Yet the report proposed such colossal changes in the political system—it was breath-taking. A Congress of Soviets, a committee for constitutional supervision...

[Question] However, after all, our delegation's platform already included such...

[Answer] We were thinking of a Constitutional Court. I think that these are really not the same thing. A Court investigates conflicts which have arisen, but supervision is, as I understand it, permanent superintendence and control over the implementation of the Constitution. However, for the time being it is still too early to judge the committee's structure... So, I will continue to discuss the surprises. The greatest surprise for me, perhaps, was the discussion of the rights of the individual, of the private citizen. We had talked about them before, but in a somewhat general sense. However, here an entire system of rights and guarantees for their defense was proposed.

[Question] Did your mood change as a measure of the conference's work?

[Answer] And how! Frankly, on the first day I did not care for the debates on the report. They seemed stale and unfriendly. Academician Abalkin was very unspecific. A prominent economist, he should have behaved differently, he should have proposed something specific, something new, for instance, something like regional cost-accounting. But the Academician started criticizing and looking for culprits among the economic leaders who lack economic knowledge. The level was not that of an all-union party conference, but of a seminar or school for directors. One of the Moscow Party Gorkom secretaries was also disappointing: his was an old-regime type of speech. His idea that Moscow ought to help everyone was unappealing not only to me. Kaibaidze also spoke about this dependency. Moreover, for some reason the arguments of writers and journalists were also tossed at

the tribunal. The writer Bondarev spoke in this key too. The writer Borovik and the renowned physician Fedorov answered him well. I could not understand why the speech by the editor of ZNAMYA, Baklanov, was interrupted: it was an interesting speech. And Ulyanov spoke so well that the mood improved, life started falling into place...

[Question] We had heard that many republic and obkom Central Committee secretaries spoke traditionally at the conference.

[Answer] It did not seem so to me. They spoke in a rigid academic style, this is true. They did not use scathing terms, but if you listen and read carefully, you will discover much that is original and new. V. Melnikov, Komi Party Obkom first secretary, was the first "disturber of the peace." He named specific names, not "certain bureaucrats," for whom we look and look and never seem to find. A. Melnikov, a worker and VAZ labor collective chairman, spoke well. In short, from speech to speech, from meeting to meeting, the conference collected turn-arounds, turn-arounds in courage, democracy, glasnost...

[Question] A difficult question...

[Answer] I understand—about Yeltsin. Boris Nikolayevich, as those who know him put it, is a direct, strict and even somewhat brutal person. I could hardly refrain from asking him: why, a future Politburo candidate member, did he not once ask to speak, did not express that which had built up in his heart? Why did he remain silent and then suddenly burst out in criticism? It does not seem very comradely. It is good that he mercilessly rooted out the mafia, particularly the trade mafia, but it is bad that innocent people suffered in passing, under his hot-tempered hand. As far as Yeltsin's speech at the conference is concerned, I think it was excellent and that his proposals were sensible. He said what he said. Yet today, in my opinion, he still does not deserve rehabilitation. In summing up the "Yeltsin theme," M.S. Gorbachev remarked that it would not have been necessary to spend so much time at the conference if the materials of the October Central Committee Plenum had been published on time. I think that both the Central Committee members and all of the conference participants learned a strong and memorable lesson: one must not suppress information, it must not be restricted and everything must be done openly.

[Question] How successfully were the basic proposals of our platform consolidated within the resolutions?

[Answer] Our platform began with debates, but once it was done it had become our collective creation. Our proposals were included in several resolutions, but the basic body of the package of proposals was incorporated within the resolution "On Relations Between Nationalities." Moreover, many of "our" ideas were expressed by

2 RETURNING DELEGATES' IMPRESSIONS

Latvian Communist Party Central Committee First Secretary Pugo and Komi Obkom Secretary Melnikov, and virtually every other delegate spoke on ecological problems.

[Question] Were any Estonian citizens on the commissions?

[Answer] Five commissions were created to work on a number of resolutions. The first, which prepared the resolutions "On the Course of Implementation of the 27th CPSU Congress Resolutions and Tasks to Intensify Restructuring" and "On Democratization of Soviet Society and Reform of the Political System," was chaired by the CPSU Central Committee General Secretary. Our own Ants Viigisalu, director of the "Vazar" Association, was part of this commission. He sat next to me in the hall, told us how work in the commission was going and constantly consulted with the members of our delegation. Arguments occurred in all the commissions and nothing came easily.

[Question] Please tell us in more detail about how you introduced an amendment to the resolution "On Relations Between Nationalities."

[Answer] This is how it happened. Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov chaired the commission. Nothing was said about regional cost-accounting in the third item. A member of our delegation, Enn Pyldroos, in his words, tried to correct the situation. However, when it came time to pass the resolution, we looked and, once again, this basic economic point had been left out. We consulted among ourselves and Academician Bronshteyn even said to me: "It must pass." I said that I did not object, so long as it was well formulated. Friday evening at the plenary session, M.S. Gorbachev asked if anyone wished to amend the resolution. I immediately took the rostrum. Mikhail Sergeyevich bent toward me and said: "Introduce yourself." I introduced myself, said that I was from Estonia, and explained why such an amendment to the resolution was necessary. I did my job and returned to my seat. After speaking to Ryzhkov about something, Gorbachev told the hall: "Yes, this amendment, on the whole, does not contradict the resolution." The proposal was even adopted in the form in which it was written in our platform.

[Question] You were also a delegate to the party congress and have participated in the work of the country's Supreme Soviet sessions several times. How did the present forum differ from these?

[Answer] People dashed into the fray without looking back. Usually they choose their words and try to "look respectable." However, here they burned the bridges and left no retreats. They said what they thought. After all, we have come so close the brink of economic disaster that it is frightening to think...

[Question] Do you think that there were opponents of restructuring in the hall?

[Answer] I think so. However, the entire course of the work, the spirit and heat of the conference did not, so to speak, leave them a leg to stand on. Remember how Mikhail Sergeyevich referred to Nina Andreyeva's letter, which she had addressed to the conference and in which, judging by everything, she holds forth on her own anti-restructuring views? So, this letter did not even require reading: everyone realized that Andreyeva's hopes had been buried once and for all. Moreover, as far as specific features of the present forum are concerned, I realized by the end of our work that the entire essence lay in these political resolutions that we had passed. It had become clear that there is no way back from restructuring.

[Question] A delicate question, which, judging by the phone calls, interests many people. Were there special buffets and stores for the delegates?

[Answer] We were given pens, notebooks and statistical materials. That was it. We had to buy everything else at normal stores and buffets. There were no gifts of any sort. However, all the same, one gift was made—it was possible to buy tickets to Moscow theaters. I was unlucky—I bought a ticket to the "Satira," but they were showing old Derzhavin and Shirvindt farces...

[Question] Then, it was not just conferences...

[Answer] There were meetings with journalists—Soviet and foreign. We made trips to our own ministries. We saw the Star City—the Flight Control Center, the hydro-laboratory, the centrifuge. We talked and debated with delegates from other countries.

[Question] What are your present concerns?

[Answer] On Monday I went to work and there was no escaping the questions. I will specify immediately that I myself must still interpret and investigate some things. The main task for me, as, I think, for the other delegates, is to explain to the people the sense and meaning of the conference, its tactics and strategy, its humane orientation. They are asking all sorts of questions, many of which we have already mentioned in this talk.

I would like to convey a thought to every person: we have no time to build up, we must work and work. We have realized that without political and legal reforms we will not break the old machine and will not broadly develop restructuring. However, the allotted time periods are brief.

The upcoming elections will already be held in a new way this spring. We, the communists, must be ready ahead of time. Previously, having nominated a candidate, we

3 RETURNING DELEGATES' IMPRESSIONS

threw him "into the stream" and let him swim. Today we must work with him and help him put together his program. We must learn how to do this.

In short, we have much work to do and there is no surplus time. In ending this conversation, I would like to share one more lesson from the conference. If we always work together as closely as we did at the conference in Moscow, we will be able to go far. There were no Russians, no Estonians, no Ukrainians—there were envoys from Estonia, who arrived with their people's views, with the republic party organization's views. There were like-minded people. After all, when our platform was first drafted, there was disagreement, misunderstanding and irritability. However, the dialogue, the willingness to listen to others and find common grounds with each other has yielded its wonderful fruits.

Let us not lose all of this...

13362

Uzbek Obkom Chief Interviewed on Conference Impressions

18000549 Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian
7 Jul 88 pp 1-2

[Interview with Salidzhan Mamarsulovich Mamarsulov, first secretary, Surkhan-Darya Party Obkom, by PRAVDA VOSTOKA correspondent V. Neyburg in Termez]

[Text] [Question] Salidzhan Mamarsulovich, you have been a delegate to a number of CPSU congresses and a participant in many Central Committee plenums. How was the 19th All-Union Conference different from previous party forums?

[Answer] Frankly it is difficult to make a comparison. The other day I read that bourgeois newspapers were referring to the conference as "4 days that shook the world." As we know, the bourgeois mass media love such sensational pronouncements. But for us, the delegates, as well, the conference was truly unforgettable.

It was the first time in my memory that a party forum was held in such an open, candid, businesslike atmosphere of bolshevik comradeship. The most urgent problems of party life and Soviet society were discussed. Every delegate said what was on his mind and in his heart without looking over his shoulder to see if the higher-ups liked his words or not. We delegates, like the entire party and all the people following the work of the conference, saw for ourselves how perestroyka, democratization and glasnost were reflected in the life of society. Fear, endless compliments addressed to those seated in the presidium, and the attempt to present oneself and one's work in a better light than warranted in reality, are becoming a thing of the past. There were

differences of opinion. It was also possible to speak of them from the podium, i. e., something that unfortunately was impossible in the past.

It used to be that when a congress or plenum ended, one experienced a feeling of dissatisfaction, a certain emptiness: there was a great deal of talking but we went away with the same thing we came with. The atmosphere became more businesslike after the April (1985) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee. The conference was also a logical continuation of this line. Its principal result was that a fundamental political program was developed on all basic questions that were the subject of general party and general public discussion on the basis of the Theses of the CPSU Central Committee. The main thing now is to implement without delay the things that the conference articulated as the key tasks.

[Question] The conference called for our party being a party of the Leninist type in full measure not only in content but also in the methods of its activity. What conclusions would you draw from this thesis with regard to the practical work of party organs and primary party organizations?

[Answer] All during the conference, while I was listening to the report of the Central Committee and the delegates' speeches, I was thinking how to apply the global formulation of the issues to practical work. And not some day, but in the very first days after my return from the capital. There are many ideas. A dramatic change in the work is needed.

It is essential to change the work style of the obkom and other party committees, to abandon methods based on commands and orders, to see to it that party policy and our own decisions are exclusively implemented through organizational, cadre, and ideological work. And of course we must ensure that the laws and democratic principles of public life are most strictly adhered to.

In their discussion of the Theses of the CPSU Central Committee, communists and noncommunists sharply criticized shortcomings in the activity of oblast party committees. There was a serious discussion of their interrelations with primary party organizations. An abstract work style and paper shuffling frequently take the place of political leadership of the primary organizations. Many of them are therefore not doing their own work but are taking the place of managers and specialists rather than concerning themselves with the development of communists' activism, work with cadres, and education.

I could enumerate a host of shortcomings, the 'residue' of the period of stagnation in the activity of the oblast party organization. But we also cannot fail to see that recent years have not passed by in vain. The style of party work is changing slowly but surely. It is becoming more effective and democratic. The change in the work style of the party obkom is probably manifested in the

4 RETURNING DELEGATES' IMPRESSIONS

fact that sittings of the obkom buro are conducted in a new way. The depth of preparation of the issues and the way in which they are discussed are largely dependent on the atmosphere in the party organization. For any communist who is invited to the buro in connection with any issue, discussion must become a school on the implementation of party policy.

The situation was unfortunately otherwise for a long time. The act of administrative tyranny, so to speak, was dominant. In order to prepare a question, an obkom instructor or department chief would visit a rayon and immediately issue orders for the preparation of a mass of paperwork, which would be the basis for the compilation of documents that usually did not reflect the real situation. As a result, the discussion was of little real benefit.

When we addressed numerous questions that were outside the party organ's competence, we became dispatchers: we lost sight of the most important aspects of the work and were unable to bring the party's influence to bear on a given sphere of life.

It would be incorrect to say that everything has now changed. But much is now being converted to the rails of perestroika. A realistic approach to questions discussed at the buro is of no little benefit. The preparation of questions is no longer the business of apparatus personnel alone. The aid of members of the elected organ is now widely enlisted in this effort. Questions are prepared without haste and all aspects of the activity of party organizations and work collectives are studied in depth.

It would seem that the time when the oblast started converting the agroindustrial complex to full cost accounting, self-support, and self-financing could be considered the beginning of the work in the new way. The party obkom was the initiator. Some might say: this is an economic question, should the oblast committee address it? No, this is a political question that stems directly from the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress. And it is specifically the party organization and its elected organ that must take the helm in their hands.

Before rendering a decision on submitting the new system of management for the discussion of the obkom buro, this question was carefully studied. Obkom members, including the secretary and other buro members, met and talked with communists and rank-and-file workers. The economy of every kolkhoz, sovkhoz and enterprise was studied with the help of oblagroprom and RAPO specialists and avenues of conversion to the khozraschet system were devised.

A large amount of what I consider to be party work was done, perestroika in oblast agriculture was discussed, and when the issue was submitted to the obkom buro, it was discussed from all sides and in depth. It was decided to make the transition to a new system of management

starting in 1988. This was not by any means a volitional decision—thousands of communists and noncommunists spoke out in favor of its adoption.

Two farms—the Kumkurganskiy “Moskva” Kolkhoz and the Leninyulskiy Sovkhoz imeni V. I. Lenin—were converted to the new system of operation already in 1987. Today it is probably too early to speak about serious results of the conversion of oblagroprom to the new system of management. But the advantages of this system are unquestionable. We—once again with the participation of the broad aktiv—are studying the progress of events in agroprom.

This March, the obkom buro discussed the guidance of the reform of the management mechanism by the party committee on the Sovkhoz imeni V. I. Lenin. We were interested in how much thought the party organization was giving to the experiment and in its businesslike attitude toward it.

A large group of obkom members and oblagroprom specialists took part in the study and preparation of the question. Meetings with sovkhoz workers were held. Study of the state of affairs revealed more that was negative than positive. It became most obvious that both the administration and party committee of the sovkhoz perceived the conversion to the new mechanism simplistically and superficially. Conditions and procedures for the effective introduction of an effective anticost mechanism were not carefully prepared and practical conditions for brigade khozraschet were not developed. The party committee underestimated the sociopolitical significance of the question. Shop party organizations and party groups were essentially not involved in the transition to the new system and demands on executives and chief specialists were relaxed.

The conversation at the obkom buro was curt, from a party position, but at the same time was highly principled in a comradely way. The secretary of the sovkhoz party committee was sternly punished. He did not take offense at this but instead we were convinced that he was inspired to work more actively.

The obkom buro's work style is changing for the better. But these are only the first steps.

[Question] Salidzhan Mamarasulov, what is your view of the structure of oblast party organs after the conference?

[Answer] If we speak of the obkom, the size of the apparatus must be reduced. As indicated in the conference's resolution “On the Democratization of Soviet Society and the Reform of the Political System.” We must abolish branch departments. Let us take a look. We have an industrial department, an agricultural department, and construction, communications, transport, and

5 RETURNING DELEGATES' IMPRESSIONS

trade departments...If they remain we will be unable to avoid decades of deeply rooted dispatching, distribution of funds, etc.—what else shall these departments concern themselves with?

I see the party obkom this way: three secretaries, a department for organizational party work, and an ideological department. And one more: I tentatively call it the socioeconomic forecasting department. This department must be staffed by competent specialists who study the situation in the social and economic spheres of the oblast. The buro and the secretaries of the obkom would be given prospects of development.

The obkom needs two sectors: a general sector and a cadre sector. There could also be just one sector. The same structure is acceptable in party gorkoms and raykoms.

A word about cadres. In particular, about party workers. We must decidedly abandon the existing system in which the chief of a Komsomol obkom department or sector, for example, is in time transferred to the apparatus of a party obkom or raykom. A party obkom instructor counts the days until he is recommended for raykom secretary. We should not make party work a profession. Engineering, agronomy, teaching, etc.—those are professions. If we set limits on the term of office for elected positions, this also applies to the apparatus. I am opposed to a person working his entire life or at any rate 20-25 years in a party obkom or raykom. Sitting in an apparatus chair for such a long time blunts his feeling for the new and makes it difficult for him to see and understand the people's life.

Another word about cadres. How many splendid young people we have on our kolkhozes and sovkhozes, at our enterprises, and at our construction sites! You talk with a communist brigade leader and you get a good feeling. He has the interests of the state at heart and he is a first-rate worker. Why do we not use them in party, soviet and trade union work? The nomenklatura system is to blame for everything.

Concerning elected organs. There are many chiefs and managers in them at present. After all, the obkom, raykom and gorkom have formed on the basis of appointments. But what, for example, if the deputy chairman of an oblispolkom is not elected, for example, to the party obkom? And why must he necessarily be elected? I think that it would be more correct to form the elected party organ in such a way that it would have more workers, collective farmers, physicians, teachers, and specialists in the national economy. Even now we have many collective farmers in the obkom. But all of them cannot by any means actively work in the elected organ.

The obkom buro, gorkoms and raykoms should also not be formed in the way they have been up to now. In my view, at least one-third of the buro should be made up of production workers who are active, energetic communists.

Here is one more thing I would like to say. We should reduce the size of the administrative apparatus more decisively. Here is an example of how an inflated apparatus gets in the way. The conference demand this and we must realize this demand. The conversion of the oblast agroprom was discussed. The lion's share of profits in agriculture goes to maintaining the extremely inflated apparatus of the republic Gosagroprom and oblast APK's. People working there generate new instructions and orders. I believe that this apparatus should be cut to the minimum.

Trusts, administrations, and other institutions are literally overflowing with people. They are called apparatchiki. Nearby, a few steps from the party obkom, "lives" Construction Trust No 165. A three-story building, dozens of offices, each of which is staffed by several persons, but the trust does not fulfill the plan and does not commission projects on schedule. How many such examples could be cited?

[Question] How do you relate to the scheduled restructuring of Soviet organs, in particular to the proposal that the first secretary of the party committee head the Soviet of People's Deputies, that he become its chairman?

[Answer] Frankly I was surprised when this proposal was first made at the conference: at the same time that we are differentiating functions we turn around and recommend that the party leader also head the soviet. But I very soon realized that this was a correct proposal. If the first secretary of a party committee is the chairman of the soviet, this will not in any way contradict the idea of differentiation of functions. This was very clearly stated at the conference. I am certain that the idea of restructuring the soviet organs has been received with understanding and approval.

[Question] The final question. What are you, First Secretary, now planning to do first?

[Answer] Like all delegates to the All-Union Conference, I voted for perestroyka, for democratization, for the Leninist style of work in all spheres of the nation's life with a feeling of deep satisfaction. Now let's get to work! At the conference there was a declaration of the resolve to continue and deepen the economic reform, to resolve the Food Program, to help the countryside in every way. We will do our utmost to strengthen the economic mechanism both in agriculture and in industry, to find new reserves, to make stricter demands on those officials who expect to have things handed to them on a platter

while they themselves haunt various offices, "signaling" that they are for some reason unable to fulfill their production program. More initiative. This is the most important thing right now.

Guards Officer Views Party Conference Achievements

18000583 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian
7 Jul 88 p 1

[Article by Lt Col Sh. Bashenov, Guards, delegate to the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference: "Right Now, Without Delay"]

[Text] The force of inertia. In taking up my pen I felt the urge to begin with enthusiasm, as was previously the custom. And though, I must say, there was also some of that, I will speak about something else—about the main thing I was thinking about at the party conference. And I was thinking above all about what I in particular could do so that perestroyka in the country, in the armed forces, in my regiment develops and becomes deeper, becomes irreversible, and leads to concrete results? How can I justify the confidence of the people who placed on me this immense responsibility of being a delegate to the conference, which I believe will be a special page forever in the history of our party? And I also thought about my guilt, about the personal part I played in that protracted tranquility that brought the country to stagnation.

The 4 days of the proceedings of the conference passed like a quick wink. But how much they contained, what bold ideas, endowed, it would seem, with conceptions that even yesterday seemed unrealistic, filled the minds and hearts of the party members and all the Soviet people. These days, that great discussion held in the conference, unprecedented in its openness, its devotion to principle, and its honesty, and the decisions adopted at it have made us stronger. I feel this in myself, I saw it in my neighbors when I returned from Moscow to my native region.

Yes, perestroyka has become a part of our life—we all see that. And even now I already feel today the real fruits of the renewal. But at the conference people also spoke with full frankness and honesty about how the changes for the better are taking place too slowly, by no means everywhere, and the revolutionary transformations have not become irreversible. To be sure, it is a reality of life that we still have not managed to overcome the profound causes of the slowdown. It does not take many examples to convince oneself of the rightness of these conclusions. It is enough to mention that the process of renewal has, as a matter of fact, just begun and is taking place in our Army units, that it is not easy to overcome the manifestations of the stagnation, and that also applies to our regiment.

Now all thoughts are about how to implement what was outlined at the conference. The main task which has been set for us, the soldiers of the armed forces, was

brought to a focus in the fundamental propositions of the report of M.S. Gorbachev on the priority of qualitative parameters both in the supply of equipment and also in the training and upbringing of the personnel of our armed forces. This spells out the purposes of restructuring in military units, it provides clear and well-adjusted points of reference in the activity of commanding officers, political entities, and party and Komsomol organizations.

How is one to undertake performance of this large and crucial task; what is to be done so as not to repeat the mistakes of the recent past? There have been quite a bit of them, these errors.

I took up my post when the ideas of restructuring were already vigorously making their way in the country's life. It was warmly supported in the Army and in the Navy. The times demanded not only approval of the innovative decisions of the party, but also specific action by everyone.

I honestly admit it: there were sleepless nights and arguments with comrades and long discussions with subordinates. There was all of it. Not everyone was immediately convinced of the idea of the need for restructuring, that we finally had to look honestly at our life and at the results of our work, to get away from half-truths in our evaluations. The first signs of restlessness were that the regimental staff of officers was virtually at odds. Not that everyone did not sit next to one another in assemblies and conferences. Everyone took up his place in the formation shoulder to shoulder. But it was not difficult for the accustomed eye to see that some people, figuratively speaking, were dragging everything out as though they were overloaded, feeling that it was conscientious to work at half-strength. There are quite a few such people in the regiment. But there were also others who confessed a different concept of what was ethical. Some officers had gotten used to the shortcomings in combat training, in the organization of the service, in discipline. It was even thought by some that it was altogether impossible to eradicate them, that they were a kind of "specific feature" of the service. And the atmosphere of security and well-being suited some people.

Meanwhile, the Army was receiving responses that were by no means flattering about the quality of training of specialists in our training regiment. And the strangest thing is that this did not very much disturb those who should have perceived this as bad work on their part.

So that the first thing that had to be done was to shatter the psychology of every officer, warrant officer, and noncommissioned officer. After all, restructuring also signifies a new departure in people's minds and hearts, in

their attitudes toward the jobs assigned them, attainment of a thorough understanding by every person of the period that is an acute experience for the country, and his own role and place in solving the problems that have come to a head.

And now, analyzing the state of affairs in the chast from the positions of the requirements of the party conference and its decisions, I have once again become convinced that the reasons for many of the ethical costs should be sought in the offices of the staff headquarters—in the omissions, in the indifference, in the irresponsibility of certain chiefs of services, deputy regimental commanders, and indeed even the commanding officer himself, if we are to be thoroughly frank. The situation demanded constructive changes, not cosmetics. We discussed all this in an expanded meeting of the party committee. The discussion we had at that time was frank and fierce. But the desire to bring about changes in the training of personnel, in strengthening discipline, to overcome manifestations of the stagnation was general, and we were able to quickly understand one another and find a common language.

The party members of the regiment saw one of the tasks of restructuring in a decisive turnabout toward the individual personality—that of the officer, the warrant officer, the noncommissioned officer, and the soldier. An endeavor was made to stir up creative initiative in people. An attempt was made to establish democratic principles in the life of the regiment by increasing the activity of the party and Komsomol organizations in solving the most important questions and by invigorating public institutions. The need gradually arose to listen to the voice of every member of the collective, to take the individual person's opinion into account. And these are not empty words. The activity of personnel in the regiment increased noticeably—this became a kind of expression of the attitude of the soldiers toward restructuring. Collective opinion is now taken into account in choosing people for positions at the higher level, in evaluating a particular innovation, and in deciding questions related to incentives. The standing certification commission and methods council have begun to enjoy prestige, and the women's council of the chast is having a noticeable influence toward improvement of the level of consumer services and leisure of military personnel, although, of course, there is need for improvement of their work.

And still, if we are to judge by the long list of assignments which the conference presented to us, it has to be admitted that we have only just begun to democratize our Army life. Can we after all speak about democratization, which first of all presupposes respect for human dignity, when there are still officers, though not so very many, including commanding officers and political officials, who still find it natural to engage in bare administration, arrogance, conceit, and rudeness toward subordinates? The uncompromising fight against such manifestations is one of our most important tasks.

In the vocabulary that has been compiled already in the years of restructuring the word "independence" is used frequently. People talk about the need to grant more independence to the farmer, to the cooperative, to the enterprise. And this is right. For my part, I suggest that more independence be given to the regimental commander. Especially in dealing with personnel matters. After all, if it were up to him, surely he would undertake to train young commanders, soldiers who are both drivers and mechanics, soldiers who are both gunners and trackers, and other specialists from people who are not ready to master precisely those military occupations. But today they simply face us with an accomplished fact: here are so many and so many men, teach them. The discussion is quite different when any of our trainees fail to justify the hopes placed on the armed forces.

Or things like this happen. In the regiment there are candidates for promotion who are well-trained and tested in action. Who if not the commander knows best who can be trusted with a company or a battalion, who to appoint chief of an arm or a service? As a rule, a position that becomes vacant is not filled by someone promoted from another chast, someone who may not be worthy in his ability to work and his moral attributes. That is exactly what happened with Lieutenant V. Shorokhov. They sent him to our regiment with the most excellent recommendations, but it soon became clear that all of the adjectives and references were faked. And this is not an isolated case. So it would seem that the times require the most serious approach to the problem of granting greater independence to the regimental commander.

And there are quite a few other problems which are waiting to be solved. There was also a great deal of severe talk at the conference about the fight against bureaucracy. This is an important task even for us in the military. The manifestations of bureaucracy are diverse. For example, up to now we have not managed to free ourselves of the flow of paper, of the preponderance of instructions and documents, of many other things that hinder our work.

As I analyzed the materials and documents of the party conference I mentally put these questions to myself: Have you been living in such a way and have you done everything so that in both words and deeds you support the course of the party toward renewal, to lead both party members and those who are not members? These are now the most important questions which we must ask ourselves.

In its recent meeting the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee expressed confidence that all party members, every work collective, and all of our country's working people would become actively involved in carrying out the decisions of the conference. Without shilly-shallying, right now, without waiting for any instructions, we party members in the armed forces must also take up this important work. Everyone who is really worthy of that

high title is called upon to become a fighter for restructuring. In deeds, not in words. This is the main order issued by the party conference.

07045

Returning Estonian Delegates Hold Press Conference

*18000568a Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA
in Russian 8 Jul 88 p 1*

[ETA correspondents R. Amos and P. Raydla report: "A Press Conference in the Press Building"]

[Text] The four days of intensive work at the conference were at the center of attention among all the people. During those days we sat riveted to our television screens and literally hour after hour followed the course of the conference. The delegates have been home for almost a week. They have been inundated with questions like fruit falling from a cornucopia. They shared their freshest impressions of the conference when they arrived at the airport. They have already had talks in the labor collectives. In the afternoon of 6 July some of the delegates met with lecturers and propagandists in the republic, and in the evening there was a live television broadcast during which the delegates responded to questions from viewers. On 7 July it was the turn of Tallinn's journalists, at the press building, where a press conference was held by conference delegates from the republic party organization. Questions were fielded by Vayno Vyalyas, Georgiy Aleshin, Arnold Ryuytel, Bruno Saul, Enn-Arno Sillari, Indrek Toome, Boris Moronov, Yukhan Aare, Mikhail Bronshteyn, Enn Pyldroos and Boris Tamm.

On the pages of the newspapers and in radio and television broadcasts much has already been said and undoubtedly will be said about the atmosphere and tension of the work of the party forum and so we are offering our readers a sample of the questions and answers covered at the press conference.

The press conference was opened by Yu. Paalma, Estonian SSR Union of Journalist Board Chairman.

They say that after a long separation, a meeting is especially desired, first secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee V. Vyalyas said in his opening remarks. They say that nostalgia is an incurable disease. There are medicines for every illness, but not that one. For years this illness has been progressing. I know from my own experience that this really is so. On behalf of the Central Committee and all delegates I would like to express my profound gratitude to the journalists of our republic, especially radio and television and ETA workers and others who covered the course of the conference and managed to convey that special atmosphere that prevailed in Moscow.

V. Vyalyas noted that the conference cannot be judged only on the basic pieces published in the press and the documents adopted; our delegation did a very great deal of work. We acted, he said, as a cohesive team, and throughout the conference we relied on that sense of cohesion in our joint actions, and this helped us to comply with the instructions issued by the republic's inhabitants. All opportunities and meetings were taken advantage of to discuss and propagandize the platform of the republic party organization and to tell about our present and our future.

Although a resolution on glasnost was adopted at the conference the most diverse views were addressed to the press from its tribune. At the same time we were reminded of the thought expressed by the General Secretary that politically, a polyphonic glasnost and perestroika will be developed only on condition that the true and real voice of the people in the person of the press exists among us.

Correctness, accuracy and professional experience are of special importance in the work of a journalist. You are like chess players who always have the first move. Make an error in nuance, permit an inaccuracy and you shape the attitude of the audience toward the trend that forces it to play things in response to your opening move. This testifies once again to your responsibility, V. Vyalyas emphasized.

The first to respond to the questioning was E. Pyldroos, chairman of the Estonian SSR Union of Artists Board. He was asked a question about relations between the Armenian and Azerbaijani delegations. I cannot answer that question, E. Pyldroos said, because outwardly at any rate no conflict was evident. And during the work of our commission, in their statements the leaders of the two delegations also called for mutual understanding and greater friendship. All that is required is to overcome all difficulties.

Estonian SSR Academy of Sciences Academician M. Bronshteyn and the first secretary of the Tallinn Gorkom E-A. Sillari also talked about the problems in Nagorno-Karabakh. They noted that at its press conference the Armenian delegation had proposed that Nagorno-Karabakh be made an autonomous oblast of all-union subordination. The Azerbaijani delegation thought that this proposal was absolutely unacceptable, asserting that it was even more outrageous than making it an oblast of Armenia.

E. Pyldroos responded to a question about compliance with the decisions of the joint plenum of the creative unions. Three months have passed and now most of the proposals and wishes that at that time seemed fantastic have been resolved. Of course, much remains to be done, and new problems have arisen. With regard to publication of materials from the plenum in a separate collection, even though the road to print is long up to now no obstacles have arisen.

9 RETURNING DELEGATES' IMPRESSIONS

Academician M. Bronshteyn dealt with economic questions. What have three years of perestroika brought? Here it is necessary to recall the statement made by Academician Abalkin, which was not greeted too favorably at the conference. The fact is that in the economy not much has yet been achieved. Some main indicators reflecting, for example, the cost of material consumption or production costs have even worsened. Of course, it is not pleasant to hear this. And so if Abalkin had analyzed certain features of economic development and violations of economic laws and had also offered a specific program, which does exist among economics scholars, it is probable that his speech would have been received differently.

The conference resolutions also talked about republic cost accounting. A question was asked about what appellate levels must be reached before the idea can be realized. M. Bronshteyn answered that it is impossible to realize the idea immediately. Certain stages must still be passed through, requiring struggles and the adoption of decisions. In and of itself a cost-accounting program for Estoniya does not mean some miraculous deliverance from all ills. Sometimes, resolutions that are too primitive are being proposed. For example: the economy should be switched from all-union subordination to republic subordination. Economics must be subordinate to economic laws! And economic regulation proceeds both at the all-union level and the republic level. What is needed first and foremost is price adjustment.

The USSR Ministry of Finance and, understandably, the Ministry of Finance in our republic, do not yet have economic levers that they can use. It is essential to learn to operate with taxes. We do not yet know how to do this. This can be seen in our Law on the Cooperatives: just because you try to milk a cow it does not mean that you get any milk, the academician joked.

B. Moronov, who dwelled once again on the speech by Academician Abalkin, said that it seemed to him that Abalkin and certain other academicians had forgotten that they were speaking at a party forum, not a scientific conference.

Chairman of the Estonian SSR Council of Ministers B. Saul was asked whether he knew about the events in Maardu. He replied that that morning he had requested that he be given information on the accident at the chemical combine and the environmental damage sustained in connection with it. As is known, the accident occurred on 23 June. The republic water authorities ordered a halt to production in 27 June at 1400 hours. By 1 July the combine was operating temporary purification equipment, which made it possible to avoid water contamination. According to the water authorities, by 1400 hours on 1 July it began possible to restart production. They also stated that there had been no pressure from the USSR Ministry of Mineral Fertilizer Production. The

inspectorate for clean atmospheric air reports that the concentration of sulfur dioxides in smokestack emissions are within the standards during normal operation.

Then B. Saul and television journalist Yu. Aare talked about ecological problems and journalistic ethics in leading workers during coverage of those problems. They recognized that tendentious coverage of painful issues can harm both nature conservation and the authority of the republic government. This was the case, for example, on 31 March in a television broadcast that told of a press conference in the House of Political Enlightenment. Yu. Aare remarked that the review of events in the television broadcast was incomplete and tendentious. He also said that our achievements in the matter of nature conservation could be significantly greater. Ecological problems were repeatedly raised at the All-Union Party Conference and there was talk about the unforgivably barbaric attitude toward nature. The "Greens" movement therefore faces a broad field of activities.

Bruno Saul also talked about the resolution on national relations in connection with the all-union departments. The resolution is notwithstanding a political document and commissions have been set up to accomplish what it stated. Then there will be a plenum and only then will the legal and enforceable enactments be taken up on a working basis. However, relations with the Union should be maintained, particularly in matters concerning defense, material-technical resources, scientific problems and so forth.

Enn Pyldroos added that there are, of course, contradictions but they reflect a polarity of views and factors in the struggle at the conference. Advocates of centralization have not disappeared and that inevitably made its impression on the resolution.

With regard to the Kuremyae mine and electric power station Bruno Saul answered that the republic government had said a categorical "no" to the so-called Viruskaya electric power station. With regard to the Kuremyae mine, there was still no sound scientific and technical reason for the mine. If we harm nature we shall have to import slate.

Responding to questions on wages for workers in the state apparatus B. Saul said that in general they will be regulated from 1991. Wages for workers in the State Committee for Industry will be sanctioned by all-union organs at the Gosplan level, and for other committees at the ministry level.

A question was asked about sugar distribution. B. Saul replied that the soviets had been given the right to distribute sugar on a monthly basis. Whatever is decided at the local level will be how it is. An application to obtain an additional amount of sugar has now been submitted. A question was also asked on the production of alcohol. B. Saul answered that he it is planned to work

along three avenues. First, to increase the production of beer as a refreshing drink. Second, to try to re-establish the production of berry wines at Pyłtsamaa, even though this will require a great deal of sugar. Third, to expand the acquisition of champagne and dry wines through barter.

Chairman of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet A. Ryuytel was asked a question about the adoption on 30 December 1922 of a very important legal basis for our union state—the treaty of union. It was noted that in the treaty too much was assigned to all-union competence and that this is leading to arbitrary rule by the central departments. Had proposals been made to alter the treaty of union?

A. Ryuytel replied that at the conference the need for this had been spoken of not only in the commissions and lobbies but also from the conference dais. The problem of federation was also reflected in one of the resolutions. This question will soon be discussed again because it is essential to draw up a new law on federation in which due consideration will be given to both to national questions and questions of relations between the various union republics.

Responding to questions, A. Ryuytel talked about creation of a legal state. One of the stages in this is to draw up an electoral law. Democratization has started from the top and should be supported from below.

Academician B. Tamm talked about problems of national education, expressing approval for the activity of the chairman of the USSR State Committee for National Education, Yagodin. Here he noted that during the conference he had dealt seriously with questions concerning the production of computer equipment in the republic. Thanks to this, resolution of the problem of computerization in the schools, which had been held back through the arbitrary rule of the all-union departments, had now been put into motion. Since yesterday we have been in possession of the appropriate documentation signed by two deputies of the USSR Council of Ministers Chairman Ryzhkov.

V. Vyalyas was asked about his attitude toward B. Yeltsin and the statements made by him. The first secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee responded as follows: "Yeltsin's speech forced me to alter the original text of my own speech, even though that was not easy to do. I was forced to do this because of a sense of political danger. It would have been naive to suggest that the ideological and organizational course of perestroika will triumph without attacks from either left or right. The recidivists at the conference also sensed this.

"I spent 5 days with Yeltsin in Nicaragua. They were difficult days and I had no desire to live through something similar again. That sense of danger prompted me to say what I said at the conference. Political demagoguery

dressed in a fine toga can lead to serious error and the appearance of illusions. That is exactly what has happened with Yeltsin. Yeltsin is a man who has no concern for perestroika because what is first for him are his own ambitions. He speaks very eloquently but his words are not underpinned by deeds. Many of his judgments on the subject of perestroika were for us, when in Nicaragua, unacceptable. I would like to quote him, using the phrase that dumfounded me: 'We in Moscow are effecting the kind of perestroika that means we have a shortage of places in the prisons for those whom we want to incarcerate.'

"And this man stood up there on the dais and shed tears; just look, he said, how unjust they have been to me. I personally know the people whom Yeltsin brought to Moscow for leading party work. You know that one of them ended his life by suicide. There were six or seven people who thanks to his style of leadership lost their ability to work. When colleagues of the deceased said that they would be going to his funeral, Yeltsin said 'Go, but you will not be able to return.' Those people had courage, and so they went.

"The last 2 years in particular have sharpened my sense of political danger and I therefore considered it my duty to speak out from the conference tribune because my party conscience forced me to do so."

Second secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee G. Aleshin said the following about the CPSU Central Committee October Plenum.

"It is a question here of two statements. You have all heard Comrade Yeltsin's second statement. But at the plenum, apart from, probably, we three—comrades Saul and Ryuytel and myself—none of the others present heard him.

"M. Gorbachev's theses on the 70th anniversary of the October were being discussed. M. Gorbachev's statement lasted for an hour-and-a-half and then several questions were asked and Comrade Gorbachev asked whether we should discuss the report. It was decided that there was no need for that. My attention was drawn to Comrade Yeltsin who had raised his hand. 'What is it, Boris Nikolayevich, do you want to make a statement?' M.S. Gorbachev asked. 'Fine, then we shall now decide this matter.' Then there were several remarks by Comrade Gorbachev on certain matters, and after that he again asked Yeltsin if he was going to insist on making a statement. Yeltsin replied that he would insist. I am trying to recall from memory and relate more or less in detail what Yeltsin said in his statement.

"First. He said that in general he agreed with the report. That during the discussion he had made his additions and amendments, and that some of them had been considered in the report, but that he did not agree with some parts of it. In particular, he said that the planned time periods were not being met on a whole series of

issues and that because of this people were losing faith in perestroika. That he had been in the labor collectives and he sensed that perestroika was petering out and that he therefore wanted to set some specific time periods.

"Second. The main thrust of his statement was that he was asking to be relieved of his duties as Politburo candidate member. What motivated him to this? Well, first of all he believed that not everything was turning out in his work as a Politburo candidate member. And also because he had unsatisfactory relations with some members of the Politburo, particularly Comrade Ligachev. He had actually talked about this at the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum. He went on to say that Comrade Ligachev was prejudicial toward him as first secretary of the Moscow party organization. That he was given all kinds of assignments that interfered with his work and the work of the Moscow party organization and that there was similar tutelage from Comrade Ligachev, the organizational department and the other departments of the Central Committee that was allegedly inspired by Comrade Ligachev and did not help matters. He went on to say that he was not pleased when certain members of the Politburo eulogized the General Secretary, and that this was being done by members of the Politburo who had been working in it for a long time. He did not name specific names. As a communist this had put him on his guard. Proceeding from all this he was asking to be relieved of his duties as Politburo candidate member. Then Comrade M.S. Gorbachev asked him a question: 'Are you asking to be relieved only of your duties as a Politburo candidate member or at the same time also of your duties as first secretary of the Moscow Gorkom?' Comrade Yeltsin replied that this could be decided by a plenum of the party gorkom. Today, therefore, he was raising the question only of being relieved of the duties of Politburo candidate member. After this, Comrade Gorbachev said that Comrade Yeltsin has already appealed to him and raised the question of being relieved of his duties as Politburo candidate member and of his duties as first secretary of the Moscow party committee. It had been decided to put the matter aside and talk about it again after taking counsel with the members of the Politburo. At the plenum this question came up unexpectedly, probably for most members of the Politburo and even more so for the entire plenum.

"And the more so because no one had raised the question of his release. And therefore, the opinion that is widespread today among part of the public, that someone forced Yeltsin to leave his post as first secretary, is at variance with the reality. In order to assess, or, let us say, understand this act, it is necessary to know Yeltsin. Here, Vayno Vyalyas was asked why he had been talking about Yeltsin. Because he had met Yeltsin in Nicaragua and did not about him from hearsay. I can also say that I know Yeltsin not just from hearsay; I know that Yeltsin is an authoritative person, with what I would call a command-pressure style in work. Today, in my opinion,

no one is saying that he is an enemy of perestroika. Everyone says that, yes, Comrade Yeltsin is an energetic man, a persistent man, a talented man in one sense, a man who knows how to achieve results, and so forth. In his speech Yeltsin said that it is essential to focus attention on two or three particular problems. For example, I know that Comrade Yeltsin resolved the problem of reconstructing a theater in Sverdlovsk city. They say that for 18 months he stood at the head of that movement and gathered everyone together everyday, sometimes twice a day. This means that he ignored everything else and let other matters in the plan pile up, but Comrade Yeltsin did resolve the task that he had set, and in 18 months rebuilt the theater. Probably the theater is an important project for Sverdlovsk city, and reconstruction was necessary. But if all of us were guided only by standing at the head of some particular matter and resolved that problem and that problem alone, I think that we would never be able to rid ourselves of the shortcomings because they arise precisely out of these kinds of authoritative methods of leadership. When he became first secretary of the Moscow party committee he replaced 23 of the 29 party raykom first secretaries, and even dismissed some of them twice, and he replaced about 70 percent of the trade union workers and about 45 percent of soviet workers; and so forth. And we see that matters in Moscow did not improve. But he was trying to show that he would bring order to things. So this was Yeltsin's system of work: in the morning he would go out to the everyday services points, travel about on public transport, meet with people and say, these are just the bureaucrats who sit up there doing nothing and I must bring them to order. And so, naturally, an aura of being almost a lone fighter for perestroika was created around Yeltsin. What was said at the Moscow city party committee plenum was the opinion of the leading part of the Moscow party organization. And it seems to me that the statement by, say, Comrade Ligachev, was not the opinion of the Politburo but the opinion of Comrade Ligachev. We are also unable to say that we agree with everything that Comrade Ligachev said."

Many questions were asked that required only brief answers. The press conference took place in a very lively and candid manner. Both those asking the questions and those responding to them were satisfied with the way it went.

09642

Estonia's Saul Views Republic's Contribution to Conference

*18000568b Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA
in Russian 8 Jul 88 p 3*

[Interview with B.E. Saul, chairman of the Estonian SSR Council of Ministers, by Ya. Tolstikov: "Self-Assertion in the Personality of the Communist"; date and place not specified]

[Text] [Question] Are you satisfied, Bruno Eduardovich, with the conference results? What, in your opinion, was its main result?

12 RETURNING DELEGATES' IMPRESSIONS

[Answer] In general I am satisfied with the results of the conference. With regard to its main result, I would distinguish three factors. First, I believe that the party conference expanded the theory of perestroika and the renewal of Soviet society, strengthening the role of the CPSU; the conference defined a strategy for further action.

Moreover the party conference promoted self-assertion in the personality of the communist delegate and of the many Soviet people who followed the course of this forum. The conference called on us to think boldly and creatively and to express our own views without looking over our shoulders. In principle we had that right previously, but we rarely exercised it. Now this right has become essentially a duty. I think that this is a very important factor. Since the conference I would say that each of its participants has been standing erect and walking tall.

Third and finally, the international authority of the CPSU has grown significantly. It has shown all the other fraternal parties an example of how we must act to democratize the life of society. It is an example that will undoubtedly be applied in many socialist countries.

[Question] Capital work was done in the republic on the main planks of the platform of the Estonian party delegation to the conference. It might be said that all the people were involved in the building of that platform. Which planks of the platform were included in the conference's final documents, in particular resolutions?

[Answer] I make bold to say that in principle all the main planks of our platform were reflected in the final documents. The conference materials are now being published in full and it will not be difficult for every person to be convinced of this personally. I would like, however, to distinguish the main propositions fixed in the resolutions. They have to do with radical changes in the economy and in social policy, the ecology, democratization of the party and of the life of society in general, creation of a legal state, national policy and international relations and so forth.

[Question] We would be interested in knowing the work mechanism of the Estonian party organization and the kinds of means delegates used when trying to bring their own platform to the attention of the conference.

[Answer] On the very first day of work we handed the conference secretariat the text of the platform signed by all members of the delegation. In his statement the first secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee V. Vyalyas set forth its main provisions, despite the time constraint. Our delegates also took part in the work of the commissions working on the resolutions, defending the planks of their platform in them. In

addition, as is known, a press conference was held for Soviet and foreign journalists, and our delegates held another for TASS, and of course, there were personal meetings.

[Question] Incidentally, what commission work were the Estonian delegates involved in?

[Answer] One commission led by M.S. Gorbachev worked on the first two resolutions, "The Course of Implementation of the Decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress..." and "On Democratization..." It included V. Vyalyas and A. Viygisalu. Initially none of our delegates was included in the commission working on the resolution "On Inter-National Relations." But we insisted at a meeting and E. Pyldroos was included in the commission. A. Ryuytel worked in the commission working on "Glasnost." As I have already said, in principle all the main proposals from the Estonian delegation were reflected in one or other of the resolutions. The members of the commission who were delegates of the Estonian party organization and actively defended our general viewpoint, deserve full merits here.

[Question] Nevertheless, as is known, initially there was no clear-cut instruction on regional cost accounting in the draft resolutions introduced for confirmation by conference delegates. At the last moment B. Moronov succeeded in introducing an amendment. It turned out that everything depended on chance—the activeness of one delegate. What in fact happened?

[Answer] In fact the draft resolutions "On Democratization..." and "On Inter-National Relations" (and it was precisely in one of those two resolutions that we were able to introduce our proposal) did not contain any direct reference to cost accounting for regions. The wordings were close but not quite what we wanted. Our representatives were unable to introduce amendments to the text at the meetings of the commissions. Obviously the failure by some delegates from other regions to understand the proposals passed in our republic did have its effect. Accordingly, when the draft resolutions drawn up by the commissions were introduced for confirmation by the conference, on the instructions of the Estonian delegation, B. Moronov spoke up. He is a worker and a deputy chairman of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. In general an authoritative kind of person. He was assigned to introduce the amendment at the concluding stage. Boris Moronov coped with his task successfully. M.S. Gorbachev and N.I. Ryzhkov took counsel together and the proposal from the Estonian delegation was adopted and included in the resolution "On Inter-National Relations." This example indicates that differing viewpoints clashed at the conference and there was a struggle. But this is a quite natural, democratic process. And here we finally succeeded in maintaining our position.

[Question] The concept of regional cost accounting is being discussed extensively on the pages of the republic press. Well, is Estonia ready to set about its realization already, without waiting for a special decision from the all-union organs?

[Answer] The assimilation of regional cost accounting is being done here, so to say, in blocs. It is essential to start with the enterprises.

As is known, 77 percent of industrial output in the republic is now being produced by enterprises that have switched to cost accounting and self-financing. All transport enterprises and organizations, the entire Estonian SSR State Agro-industrial Committee and the entire republic Gosstroy have been switched to cost accounting. In January 1989 the switch to cost accounting will have been completed. The republic is assimilating wholesale trade in the means of production for the entire national economy. This is yet another step on the road to republic cost accounting. Moreover, our foreign economic ties also deserve expansion, particularly joint-venture enterprises with foreign firms. Today dozens of such enterprises have been set up. And finally, preparations are under way for a reform of wholesale prices and compilation of the republic budget on the principles of normative relations with the country in general. And these are the principles of republic cost accounting.

One integral part of republic cost accounting is improving the management structure in the national economy and reducing the management apparatus. And, as is known, we are doing this work. At the same time, under the leadership of the Estonian SSR Academy of Sciences Economics Institute a deepening and acceleration of theoretical work on regional cost accounting are taking place. Another five groups of scientists are working along the same avenue. In the near future we are also setting ourselves the task of adopting legal acts that will extend the rights of the union republics in all-union organs. Our proposals in this matter were presented to the USSR Council of Ministers on 24 July this year.

[Question] Bruno Eduardovich, to judge from everything, you are now an active supporter of regional cost accounting. But what was your initial reaction to the proposals of the Four as expressed in the newspaper EDAZI in September 1987?

[Answer] In principle I have always favored regional cost accounting. I would like to remind you that way back in 1984 the republic council of ministers sanctioned an agreement for such work between the Estonian SSR Gosplan, the Estonian SSR Academy of Sciences, and the USSR Academy of Sciences Economics Institute.

With regard to the "proposal of the Four," in its initial form it contained proposals that were unrealistic for that stage. For example, introducing our own convertible currency on the territory of the republic, and so forth.

These proposals, quite naturally I think, evoked a negative response both from me and from a number of economists in the republic. However, at that moment we had not considered the political significance of the very idea of E. Savisaar and those who thought as he did, nor the response that this article evoked, nor the benefit that accrued from the resulting debate. Incidentally, in a SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA interview published later, on 17 April, E. Savisaar expressed certain other quite realistic proposals about republic cost accounting. I would say that an evolution of views on the problem has occurred on both sides. In principle we have now reached a common standpoint although we still do not have an integrated concept of republic cost accounting; we expect this from the scholars by November this year. Support from other republics—Belorussia, Lithuania, Latvia, Georgia—is acting as a major help in our own aspirations. In one form or another delegates from the party organizations in those republics offered proposals at the conference on regional cost accounting similar to our own. And since the same idea is exciting many people, it can be stated with confidence that we are on the right path.

[Question] Notwithstanding, regional cost accounting is not some panacea for our common ills...

[Answer] By some chance linguistic coincidence the acronym for "cost accounting in Estonia" is "ime" in Estonian, meaning "miracle." But it is no miracle in reality, no panacea. Like cost accounting in general, regional cost accounting is first and foremost labor, working in a new way, with spirit. Bold thinking and innovation are essential. And it is a great responsibility. When the republic switches to regional cost accounting there will be no going back.

I would also like to emphasize that regional cost accounting must be associated closely with the socialist method of production and be oriented on an all-union division of labor; it is essentially international because it serves people of all nationalities not just one nation.

[Question] In the general atmosphere reigning at the conference it was felt that many delegates were experiencing some hostility toward the press. Attempts were made to interrupt representatives of the corps of journalists speaking at the conference halfway through, and to drive the editor of the journal ZNAMYA, G. Baklanov, from the dais. Journalists took this badly. We are working for a common cause, and that includes criticizing shortcomings. Perhaps this is essentially the heart of the matter—who likes criticism? What is your opinion of this?

[Answer] The press is undoubtedly helping perestroyka; without the mass media glasnost would be impossible. Our press has done much, for example, in the struggle against the monopoly of the all-union departments. Similar thoughts were also expressed at the party conference. But let us be self-critical; the press does have its shortcomings: sometimes it lacks competence and a good

sense of argumentation in its published pieces, and depth in its statements. However, it must be recognized that some party, economic and other leaders were unprepared for the degree of glasnost that has been opened up for our society. We must develop together a sense of trust in one another.

[Question] Many of us followed the course of the conference on television. And the impression was created that one speaker would express one thought, and this would be followed by applause; then someone expresses a thought diametrically opposed to the first, and the applause would be just as loud. It seemed that the same people were applauding for and against the same thing. Is this observation of a television viewer correct?

[Answer] It was a bad thing that some delegates abused applause and sometimes hampered the speaker so that the chairman had to restore order in the hall. It is not impossible that some people did also applaud opposing viewpoints; this indicates a certain inconsistency on the part of delegates. However, most were principled: they expressed support for some proposals and rejected others. This is also pluralism of opinions and tolerance in thinking, which in my opinion should only be welcomed.

[Question] Bruno Eduardovich, as chairman of the republic Council of Ministers, what do you believe must be done first and foremost now, on your return from Moscow?

[Answer] On Monday the Presidium of the Council of Ministers heard my report on the results of the 19th All-Union Party Conference. For us, priority will now be given to implementation of the Food Program, for which additional funding and resources are required, and fulfillment of the 1988 plan for the republic's social development—the construction of housing, schools, hospitals and cultural projects. And finally, implementation of measures for regional cost accounting. In this connection a proposal is being drawn up for the reform of wholesale prices for meat and dairy products. If the public supports these proposals we shall set to to implement them.

On 25 July the Estonian SSR Council of Ministers will review measures aimed at implementing in full the provisions in the platform of the republic party organization at the 19th All-Union Party Conference.

09642

Estonian Journalist Comments on Conference Discussion of Press
18000568c Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 8 Jul 88 p 3

[ETA interview with Yukhan Aare by P. Raydla: "With a Journalist on the Subject of Journalism"]

[Text] It used not to be usual for us to select journalists as delegates to major party forums. Now we have precedent for this. The television commentator Yukhan Aare was a

delegate to the 19th All-Union Party Conference. Although he has of late been called "Green No 1" I wanted to speak with him about the press. This is a word that was often heard during the conference. Much was said about the need for a law on the press. An animated dialogue took place on the subject between M. Gorbachev and M. Ulyanov. This is how here in Estonia we saw what was going on at the conference. It was with these thoughts in mind that I spoke with Yukhan Aare.

[Answer] Of course, at the conference the conversation repeatedly turned to the press. Some of those speaking thought that in some sense it has got out of hand. Perhaps this is sometimes the case. Most attention was paid to the fact that very often, and often in crucial and important materials, we encounter incorrect information, distorted facts, unchecked figures. Yes, in principle there are no banned subjects; we can talk about everything, criticize everyone; on one condition: the facts laid out must always accord with the reality. The press should not become a field for internecine abuse. Obviously it is essential to adopt a law on the press that will make it possible to hold liable any journalist who insults or compromises anyone in print.

[Question] When I heard some of the speeches I had the feeling that there was a great deal of hostility toward the journal OGONEK. Is this true?

[Answer] No. The attitude toward OGONEK was not at all hostile. The reason for these claims was the article "Resistance" published in issue No 26 of the journal, in which it was asserted that even among the conference delegates there were people who engaged in bribe-taking. Those attending the conference thought that if this kind of verified information does exist then the people concerned should have been named. Otherwise anyone seated in the hall could have been suspect. So evidently the animosity was not justified here.

[Question] The Estonian delegation met with people from the newspaper IZVESTIYA and from TASS. What came out of those meetings?

[Answer] A great deal. The conversation with the editorial staff of the newspaper IZVESTIYA lasted almost 2 hours. Those present included the deputy chief editor and another five journalists. We tried to answer the main question posed in Moscow in the most diverse circles: what is happening with you there in Estonia? We explained that nothing impermissible was taking place, we are simply implementing perestroika, including in the press, which is publishing a debate on economic, national and other problems that has already become traditional. This is being done both through the Popular Front and the "Greens." We told them what lies behind our platform. I would like to thank Academician Mikhail Bronshteyn, who explained the situation in our republic in a professional, graphic and concise manner. The

statement made by Enn Pyldroos was also very substantial. They have already published one relatively small piece in IZVESTIYA (28 June, written by P. Raydla). There is to be another.

The 3-hour meeting in TASS was very substantial. Representatives of the main editorial office for information in the foreign press and the main editorial office for information for the all-union press telegraph agency. Many of us spoke.

[Question] Was there discussion of the work of ETA as one of the subdivisions of TASS?

[Answer] Some. The main task again was to explain our viewpoint. I can only say that we have selected the absolutely right path. The thrust of the conference favored our ideas. In general, I am an optimist by nature, and after the conference became even more so.

[Question] At the meeting with foreign journalists held at the USSR Foreign Ministry press center an AFP correspondent asked a question about what is a sore point for us, namely the coverage in the all-union press of what is going on in Estonia...

[Answer] And this is why we met with the people from IZVESTIYA and TASS. TASS intends to put out major material on Estonia. I already have a very thorough review of all the main problems in the republic prepared by the Novosti people. It will be distributed throughout the Soviet Union. It talks about regional economic autonomy, the Popular Front, the "Greens" movement and so forth. In addition, we met a great deal with foreign journalists. Members of the delegation gave an interview for television in the United States, Great Britain, Hungary and Finland, and for BBC radio. Talks were held with representatives of the large information agencies such as Associated Press and AFP. A correspondent from one of the Spanish newspapers came to me personally. And many of us had to combine our breakfast with interviews. It seems to me that we simply could not have done more because of the time constraints.

[Question] Were there contacts with journalists from the other all-union republics?

[Answer] There were, but because of the colossal amount of business they were rare. From 1000 hours to 1400 hours we were in the Palace of Congresses, then there was a break for lunch, during which time we worked seriously, and then back to the Palace of Congresses. And so unfortunately contacts between the delegation were quite limited. Here I would like to say that as far as I know Estonian television was the only one among the republican television services whose cameras were fixed on the proceedings at the conference. Our television journalists also conducted interviews in the foyer, where there were no other television people.

[Question] As far as I know the press conference for our delegation was not at first planned...

[Answer] Yes. At first they were saying that we would not hold a press conference. But at the insistent demand of foreign journalists the press conference did take place after all. They asked a great deal and they knew what they were talking about. For example, a correspondent from one of the Spanish newspapers, and representative of the NEW YORK TIMES and many others asked questions showing that they are au fait with the latest events taking place here. They also knew about what was happening at Pevchevskiy Field, and about the Popular Front and the "Greens" movement, and that the republic was asking for economic autonomy.

[Question] At the press conference Vayno Vyalyas invited foreign journalists to visit Estonia. Was anything concrete agreed on this with anyone?

[Answer] As far as I know on the morning of 2 July one of the NEW YORK TIMES' best known journalists arrived in Estonia. Many journalists expressed a wish to come here. For example, I met with a representative of the BBC who had recently been in Estonia. In fact, life is very busy and an exchange of information has started. If you read PRAVDA it becomes clear that the now completed conference is at a basically higher level. Everything that Yeltsin, Ligachev, Gorbachev, Vyalyas and other speakers said, right down to the last word, was published in the newspaper. This is proof of maximum glasnost. There simply could not be anything more. And this is democracy.

09642

Lithuania's Songayla, Returning Delegates Speak at Party Meeting
18000609 Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian
9 Jul 88 pp 1, 3

[Text] On 8 July in Vilnius the party and economic aktiv of the republic's capital and the city's community met with delegates to the 19th All-Union Conference in the LiSSR State Academic Opera and Ballet Theater. The meeting was attended by the following delegates to the conference: R. Songayla, first secretary of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee; V. Astrauskas, chairman of the Presidium of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet; A. Brazauskas, secretary of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee; L. Maksimovas, chairman of the Lithuanian Republic Trade Union Council; Y. Lukauskas, chairman of the LiSSR People's Control Committee; E. Eysmuntas, chairman of the LiSSR State Security Committee; K. Zaletskas, first secretary of the Vilnius City Party Committee; A. Matzeytis, first secretary of the Lithuanian Komsomol Central Committee; V. Martinkus, chairman of the Board of the LiSSR Writers Union; I. Gyardvilis, diesel locomotive engineer of the Vilnius Locomotive Depot of the Baltic Railroad; Yu. Gramatskayte, fitter at the Production Association "Vilnius Heating Equipment Plant imeni 50-Letiye

SSSR"; K. Klimashauskas, general director of the Scientific-Production Association "Venta"; I. Tumas, painter at the Vilnius City Construction Repair Trust; and V. Zhukovskiy, milling machine operator at the Vilnius Electrical Welding Equipment Plant.

After he opened the meeting, K. Zaletskas, first secretary of the Vilnius City Party Committee, turned the floor over to R. Songayla, first secretary of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee.

Esteemed comrades! Impressions of the 19th All-Union Party Conference are extremely strong. They require both reflection and sorting out, especially after publication of all the documents adopted at the conference.

It is quite difficult to recreate and express the spirit which gradually came to prevail and did prevail in the Kremlin Hall of Congresses during all 4 days of the proceedings of the conference. It gripped all of its participants and all the Soviet people with the unprecedented revolutionary passion and innovation, openness, and the greatest responsibility for our society's future and with its critical, constructive and creative spirit. It was truly a magnificent and long-awaited forum for glasnost. This alone has given the conference particular significance. But the main thing, of course, is the content of the proceedings of the conference, its programmatic political position, which was worked out on a truly nationwide basis and with hitherto unprecedented activity on the part of the broadest masses of party members and workers who are not members of the party.

The scale of the discussion in our own republic of the Theses of the CPSU Central Committee for the 19th All-Union Party Conference gives a vivid indication that that is the way it really was. More than half a million party members and nonmembers took part and more than 50,000 people took the floor in the open assemblies of party organizations and work collectives and in the plenums of party committees. We should add to this the immense flow of letters to the Lithuanian CP Central Committee and to the editors of newspapers and journals, the hundreds of suggestions presented over the telephone to our Central Committee. In all, more than 37,000 proposals and requests were received.

It has to be declared with full responsibility that not a single constructive proposal will fail to receive attention. They will all be carefully examined and summarized, and the most important ones that are the most far-reaching will be sent on to the CPSU Central Committee. As is well-known, these proposals were published on the eve of the conference in summary form in the republic press and along with the Theses of the CPSU Central Committee they became the platform for the activity of our delegation at the party conference.

Now in the name of our entire party delegation I would like to briefly inform you about its activity at the 19th Party Conference. Here are some figures. We had two

delegates on the presidium of the conference, two on the credentials commission, and two on the editorial commission. They took an active part in preparing the drafts of the conference's resolution. There were eight of our delegates working as members of commissions to prepare them.

Four of our delegates signed up to take part in the conference's discussion of the report of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. Summaries of the speeches of the other comrades were presented to the secretariat of the conference, and they will be appended to the protocol of the conference. This is also one of the new features indicative of strengthened democracy in the party.

You have all followed closely the proceedings of the conference, you have had an opportunity to familiarize yourself with all its documents. It can be said that all the materials of the conference have been published in the press, from the first word to the last. It seems important at this point for all our people, party members or nonmembers, to get a thorough grasp and make a careful study of the documents of the conference. And if we ponder them as we should, then we will see that our party and its Central Committee have been striving and are able not only to consult with party members and all the workers, but also to listen to their opinion, to rely on that opinion in deciding all important questions concerning the restructuring and renewal of our society. After all, the documents of the conference have in essence reflected all the most important proposals of party members and other representatives of our republic's community, though not always in the form in which they were presented. Some of them would seem to be relevant today, especially those to which closer attention was paid during discussion of the Theses.

Large and crucial practical tasks have been set in the matter of reforming the political system. The most important of them is distinguishing the functions of bodies of the party and state and increasing the responsibility of soviets of people's deputies. There will be a radical change in the content, forms, and methods of party work. The center of gravity in the activity of party bodies and organizations at all levels will be shifted to the ideological and organizational effort in the masses and to the training and assignment of personnel. We must accordingly conduct a proper review of the structure of the staff organization of party committees.

Soviets of deputies are being granted the rights of deciding all issues related to economic and sociocultural development within their respective jurisdictions. The soviets are being granted real power so that they can perform these functions properly, and the relevant financial and material resources will be concentrated in their hands. As is well-known from the documents of the conference, the functions and structure of the soviets and of their executive bodies and the principles of their

formation are being reviewed. It is recommended that the first secretaries of the respective party committees be elected chairmen of the soviets at all levels, beginning with the rayon soviets.

There will be quite a bit to do in this connection in the very near future so as to carry out these major transformations.

Other important proposals of party members and workers of our republic were also reflected in the decisions of the conference.

Take, for example, the proposal about regional cost accounting. We find an answer to it in a number of the conference's documents. And in the resolution "On Interethnic Relations" it is explicitly stated that "the idea of the transition of the republics and regions to the principles of cost accounting, with clear-cut determination of their contribution to performance of all-union programs deserves attention." This, of course, evokes a feeling of satisfaction in all of us. But can we leave it at that? In no case. The time has come to move from discussions to concrete deeds, from ideas to working out the conception of regional cost accounting, to undertake the preparation of proposals for implementing it. It is a very good thing that even on 1 July, when the conference was still going on, there was a meeting of the commission of the LiSSR Council of Ministers which has been commissioned to examine and make proposals on matters of the economic reform, regional cost accounting, ecology, and other matters; along with other business at that meeting a working group was created for the economic reform and regional cost accounting, headed by E. Vilkas, member of the academy. As you know, other groups have been commissioned to draft proposals on other matters of restructuring. We are placing great hopes on the activity of these commissions and groups, and we are counting on extensive help from them in solving the problems that have arisen.

Carrying out orders from party members and the public of Lithuania, we raised the issue in the conference of the national language as the official language of the union republic. The resolution of the conference stated the need "to show more concern about the active use of national languages in the various spheres of state, public, and cultural life." At the same time, as you are aware, the conference called attention to the fact that there should not be extremes in this regard. Bilingualism is indispensable in our multinational state. We cannot do without the Russian language as a means of interethnic exchange between people, just as inhabitants of a republic belonging to other nationalities cannot do without a knowledge of that national language. Of course, that also requires creating the relevant conditions. The conference, as you know, supported the proposal of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee on calling a plenum of the CPSU Central Committee on the issues of ethnic relations, at which the entire set of problems involved here would be taken up.

But the most important question at the conference was the question of carrying out the decisions of the 27th congress and of more thorough restructuring. The conference came to the conclusion that a process of economic recovery has begun and a turnaround has taken place toward meeting the most important requests of the public. The new economic methods are gradually taking root. But on the whole, the condition of the economy has been changing slowly, especially if one judges by the end result—the people's standard of living. The conference, as is well-known, advanced the food problem as the greatest sore point and most acute problem in the life of society. The results achieved by our republic in this area were favorably assessed. Of course, we are still far as yet from a full resolution of this problem, but things are going relatively well. For that, we must always be grateful to our farmers, to the peasantry, who in spite of well-known difficulties, have been able to solve quite well the essence of the food problem, which is vitally important to the entire society.

As was repeatedly said from the speaker's platform at the conference, more attention should be paid to rural areas. The documents of the conference have emphasized that the essence of farm policy is restoring economic and social equilibrium between city and countryside, changing production relations in agriculture itself. Otherwise we will neither solve the food problem, nor perform the other important tasks of restructuring. That is why we could not pass over this question in silence from the speaker's platform of the conference either. We emphasized that one of the priorities in restructuring the structural policy of the economy in the period immediately ahead are the social and economic development of rural areas, above all rural housing construction and the solving of other problems of social welfare.

The new economic methods have to be introduced, and the feeling of being masters of their land has to be restored in all graingrowers. Only in this way will we be able to successfully solve the problem of supplying food to the republic's entire population. Another problem that is extremely acute for our republic is that the construction industry and building materials industry are lagging behind the growing needs. This is holding back all of capital construction, especially the solution to the housing problem. So that this problem has also been reflected as it should be in the documents of the conference, including proposals of our delegation. And at the very first meeting after the conference of the Bureau of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee we discussed the question and took a decision on improved supply of physical resources to capital construction. A broad program was outlined for the period 1988-1995 so that the republic can independently meet its needs for building materials, products, and fabrications.

The conference set the task of speedily supplying various high-quality goods and services to the population. Although on the whole, plans for the production of these goods are being fulfilled in the republic and for certain

consumer goods even overfulfilled, the demand is still not being fully met. The reason is that we still have been unable to overcome the departmental approach of certain managers to their work, attempts to conceal indifference toward product quality and the requirements of effective demand with comparatively good summary indicators concerning fulfillment of the plan. We consider it our duty to monitor more closely the work of supervisory personnel of those branches and industrial enterprises and to be more exacting toward them. We will hope that the decisions of the conference will help us in overcoming those large obstacles and deficiencies whose causes lie within the limits of the republic. And there are truly quite a few such obstacles.

The problem of ecology resounded with a note of great concern and anxiety at the conference. The situation has not been developing favorably in our republic either, as we openly said at the conference, pointing to some of the main reasons. This is above all the result of the administrative-command system for management of the economy and the restriction on the rights of the union republics. It has to be admitted that representatives of our public who have been criticizing the bodies of leadership of the republic for not being decisive enough were right. We are drawing conclusions from that criticism. In this collection, I would like to return to the problems of building the Ignalinskaya Nuclear Power Station. We expressed criticism on this question at the conference. And here, it seems, we should make a clarification, since our translators led the public into confusion. The leadership of the republic not only considers it indispensable to submit to the country's government a proposal for cessation of construction of the third unit of the power station, as was published in the republic press, but it has already made such a recommendation and did so back on 8 June of this year.

We will be persistent in our action to solve the other painful ecological problems as well, taking the position that we have been given an effective mandate to do so by the 19th All-Union Party Conference. This concerns above all such matters as construction of treatment installations in Kaunas and certain other cities of the republic, restoration of the old section of Vilnius and many other ecological problems. An important and, I would say, leading role in this area should go to the newly created Republic Natural Conservation Committee, which has been granted broad powers.

We are all striving for a single goal—successful performance of the program of restructuring of our society proclaimed by the party, the strengthening of socialism, imparting to it authentic Leninist features, and the building of a happy life for all the workers. And we must achieve this noble goal acting together, in close unity and cooperation.

We are sincerely grateful to the community for broad and active support during the preparation for the all-union conference. Very good decisions were adopted at

it, decisions that make it possible to turn restructuring into an unstoppable and irreversible process. But even the best decisions cannot in and of themselves bring benefit and they will not be worthwhile unless success is achieved in implementing them consistently. In the past, we have had repeated opportunities to see this. That is why now we need to rally all forces without delay for speedy accomplishment of everything outlined by the conference. Persistent, skillful, and creative effort of every citizen in the area or work station assigned him—that is the main thing now. Nor, of course, can we do without discussions and confrontations of opinions and debate. This is one of the very important factor of social and economic progress. But our debate must be constructive and must bring people together to solve our common problems.

With this in mind we cannot but touch upon the activity of certain informal associations and groups in our republic: in particular, a number of features of the activity of the initiating group of the movement for restructuring. The conference, as is well-known, considers their activity a constructive phenomenon only if it really pursues the goal of promoting the renewal and strengthening of socialism. But the conference condemned any activity which objectively rends the unity of our people, incites them, undermines the foundations of the socialist society, arouses ethnic enmity, and ultimately draws attention of people away from the most urgent problems of the present day. We cannot and have no right to reconcile ourselves to such attempts. This also applies to certain unfounded and ideologically dubious articles in certain periodicals.

The workers of Soviet Lithuania, under the leadership of the Communist Party, have repeatedly proven with deeds that even in the most difficult periods they are able to successfully perform the most complicated tasks. Now that our life is filled with the vivifying air of restructuring, conditions are taking shape very favorably for the creative effort of society and every person individually. So, acting in concert, we are doing everything so as to best utilize and successfully perform the decisions of the 19th All-Union Conference of our party under these conditions.

Allow me to wish you the greatest success. Thank you for your attention.

"Even I, a fitter doing machine assembly operations at the Vilnius Heating Equipment Plant imeni 50-Letiye SSSR, was among the delegates of the republic's party organization to the 19th All-Union Party Conference," said Yu. Gramatskayte. "Participation in this forum of party members was a great event in my life and an immense responsibility. In evaluating the conference I would like to note its democratic character, the business-like tone of discussion, and the critical view of reality.

19 RETURNING DELEGATES' IMPRESSIONS

"As a representative of the working class, I wanted above all to hear answers to the questions that have long disturbed us and which we encountered in the work collectives. These are how the economy will develop, what is being done to raise labor productivity and to improve product quality. After all, it is no secret that we often go no further than to talk about technical progress and go on working with outdated and worn-out equipment, while technical innovations created by our scientists and engineers do not always prove to be better than the old units. If we are to talk about the independence of the enterprise, then we feel ourselves fettered, the command methods are still dominant. The delegates to the conference and plant managers spoke rather severely on these matters.

"I was elected a member of the commission to prepare the drafts of two resolutions. These were the resolution entitled 'On Progress in Carrying Out the Decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the Tasks of Deepening Restructuring' and 'On Democratization of Soviet Society and the Reform of the Political System.' There were 165 delegates elected to that commission. We met three times under the chairmanship of M.S. Gorbachev. Each of us was able to express his opinion and to make suggestions about the draft of the resolution. The commission also took up the questions and statements of individual delegates sent to the presidium. For instance, S. Fedotova, a delegate who is a teacher from Perm, submitted a proposal for adoption of a separate resolution on the problems of young people and on enhancing the role of the Leninist Komsomol as a political organization in the life of society. After deliberation we came to the unanimous conclusion that the resolution must include a separate point on the problems of young people.

"During discussion of the resolution on the reform of the political system most members of the commission asked for additional clarification to be given to the delegates as to how the functions of the bodies of the party and state would be delineated. Our request was taken into account.

"I would like to note that in the discussion of the Theses of the CPSU Central Committee for the conference the workers of our plant declared a desire that all the leaders of party and soviet bodies be elected by secret ballot. The proposals of the commission coincided on this issue with the orders of my collective.

"One of the resolutions of the conference covered inter-ethnic issues rather thoroughly. It seems that now there will be more concrete appreciation of the interests of all nationalities and ethnic minorities and the rights of the republics will be broadened. As a representative of collective of workers I think that the issues of ethnic relations have to be dealt with in a thoughtful way, without violation of the principles of socialism and

friendship of peoples. After all, we live in one region and we share our joys and worries. That is why we must respect one another's feelings and convictions."

The floor was then turned over to V. Martinkus, chairman of the Board of the LiSSR Writers Union.

"The processes which have begun in our country remind me, the son of peasants, of plowed ground, recall the folksongs about the image of the crop in the field, longed for but not yet realized," he said. "I am using the field in the spring as a metaphor, one of the main aspirations which has to be brought to fruition in the near future. After all, we have become pretty much bored with talk about the troubles of our agriculture, about how unfair it is to blame the farmer for being lazy or sluggish, with arguments to the effect that our workers must finally make the farmer a wooden plow that does not loosen the earth too deep and break it up too fine so as to disfigure the face of the earth. We are tired of begging our workers to bring out into the fields 'horses' which would not constantly lose their shoes, so that a new wheel would not have to be made to replace the one that has come off and smashed to smithereens. We are tired of thinking that the land is fertile only somewhere else—in Holland or Canada.... Lithuania always has been and remains a fertile region, and the entire country sees it and knows it, just let us finally decide ourselves when, where, and what to plow and to plant, when to bring in the harvest, and what to heap into which corn bins.

"The conference has proposed creating the legal and economic guarantees of this.

"The resolutions of the conference were not, of course, designed just so that farmers would tomorrow or the day after tomorrow realize their ancient dreams. As I have already said, I am speaking in metaphors about the goals of time-saving. It seems that the metaphor is apt not only for the graingrower in our republic. The metaphor 'repair the wooden plow,' though, would seem to be clear to everyone. It also sounds nice and has a broad implication, reflecting the temper of our own feelings. We all expect and believe that the last hours of the conference's work represented more than a cheerful disposition, more than a profound sense of the need for restructuring. The report, the speeches, even the letters and notes to the presidium and responses that were not delivered, but were mentally 'recited,' the articles in the press and radio and television programs produced a strong impression of maximum concreteness.

"As a delegate I receive several hundred letters and proposals of diverse content. Incidentally, many of them were the same or similar. There were even those which could and should be dealt with not at a conference, but by the present soviets of our city and our republic. As never before, in my view, people believed in the conference and also in the rights and duties of its delegates: in short—in the power of the conference. Which is why such a critical attitude was taken toward the democratic

aspect of election of the delegates. Some of the proposals it seems we will be able to implement only in several years. The new soviets are truly needed to accomplish them! But achievement of some of them, it would seem, should not be postponed. And they must be discussed this very day, that is, by the present soviets, however difficult it might be for them on the eve of the great changes. Disturbing remarks and hopes were expressed at the conference about our spiritual values. About our conscience. About the truth uttered for all to hear or kept silent, about our respect or lack of respect for every person and for every nationality. About the viability of our culture which has drawn its vital force in the past and—in a certain sense—in the future—from our plans, our longings, our dreams. Literature is one of the aspects of our overall cultural process. Our literature is like a strand from the national ribbon woven from the Lithuanian national heritage—and not merely Lithuanian—the language, the traditions, the songs, the melodies, the sayings.... It has to be created and nurtured through our common efforts. Literature needs the press, the press is the field in which literature sows its crop and where it flowers and is harvested or left to fallow. The press is literally the dwelling place of the truth which we all need, the truth that heals and the truth that gives reassurance. That is why I returned from the conference in a somewhat distracted state, since a number of my fellow writers and certain delegates did not conceal their skeptical attitude toward the present-day literary (and not only literary!) press. There was evidently a modicum of truth in the sharp rejoinders, but however that might be, I want to write the word 'Press' with a capital letter.... It is difficult to overestimate its importance in the time of glasnost, social justice, the flowering of science, journalism, and belles lettres, in the time of our restructuring. Literature, then, is also a field for whose plowing the conference proposed 'repairing' the wooden plow."

V. Zhukovskiy, milling machine operator at the Vilnius Electric Welding Equipment Plant, came to the microphone.

"I would like to call your attention to the impression which I had during the conference. I was a witness that the conference gained strength every day, the questions were put more sharply, and the various proposals were discussed more critically.

"I will tell briefly about those desires, orders, and questions which you expressed to the delegates from the republic. The main thing which they contained was that restructuring must not get bogged down. We have a duty to solve those problems which have arisen in our life. This especially applies to the economy. Here we must only go forward.

"I approved the speech of L.I. Abalkin, director of the Economics Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, although it was later criticized. In my view, he is right when he says that quality and quantity are incompatible. I have become convinced of this in my many years of

experience—as soon as you begin to hurry, the quality of the product suffers greatly. That is why production should be organized in such a way that the problems of quality are always in the first place."

K. Klimashauskas, general director of the Scientific-Production Association "Venta," began his statement by replying to a question from the audience about the harm inflicted on the environment in Vilnius by an enterprise of the association and he specifically explained what steps had been taken to correct the situation this year and in the years to come.

"Many delegates to the conference," he said later, "concentrated attention on discussion of the urgent problems of the economy, noting that constructive developments have already become evident in this area. But a substantial turnaround has not yet been forthcoming. Leveling, the desire to live at someone else's expense, still remains a serious obstacle on the road toward development of an intensive economy. That is why today we need a more decisive transition in industry to such progressive economic methods as full cost accounting, self-financing, and the collective contract. Unfortunately, implementation of the Law on Work Collectives and on enhancing their role is falling apart. The volume of state orders at most enterprises reaches 100 percent. That is why it is notable that the decrees of the conference have emphasized once again that state orders for enterprises must be cut back so as to grant them authentic independence.

"The question of relations between work collectives and the soviets was discussed in detail. These relations must be based solely on a legal foundation and standards whereby enterprises will transfer a certain portion of their resources to the budget of soviets. In this case, their executive committees become full-fledged bosses in construction of municipal-service and consumer-service facilities and in other economic activity. The concentration of resources in the executive committees will also make it possible to effectively deal with important issues of ecology. Aside from solving the other problems enumerated, we need to wage a determined fight against manifestations of bureaucracy in the central statistical administration. The procedure for collecting party dues should be simplified.

"Much attention was also paid at the conference to scientific-technical progress. Unfortunately, not a single delegate proposed a more straightforward economic model of scientific-technical progress. G.I. Marchuk, president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, noted that science is not ready to solve the problems posed by restructuring because it does not have adequate financing of basic scientific research. Meanwhile the proposals of many delegates expressed the opinion that science should be converted to full cost accounting. In my views, these proposals are too categorical. It is another matter if that kind of financing were only for basic research and applied research on a more restricted scale. One of the

defects of the present economic model is that there are practically no incentives for rapid creation of a new product and for putting it into production.

"The conference demonstrated once again that people believe in restructuring. Although a specific answer was not given to all questions, we did work out a clear line for further expansion and deepening of restructuring."

The delegates answered numerous questions from those who attended the meeting.

07045

Shcherbitskiy Addresses Returning Conference Delegates

18000572b Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian
9 Jul 88 p 1

[RATAU Article "To Organize the Actual Implementation of the Party Conference Decisions: Meeting of Delegates From the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference With Workers From the Central Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party"]

[Text] A meeting was held at the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine for delegates from the 19th CPSU Conference in the aim of determining the main immediate measures to actually implement its decisions.

Speaking at the meeting was the member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and First Secretary of the Ukrainian CP Central Committee, V.V. Shcherbitskiy. He pointed out that the Soviet people welcomed the decisions of the 19th Party Congress which was held in a new, it can be said, truly Leninist spirit. There was an open, sharp and truly democratic discussion of all the pertinent questions of our society's life. This was a true party discussion of how to accelerate restructuring and make it irreversible. In the auditorium there were no passive or indifferent individuals.

A professional, critical tone at the conference was struck, undoubtedly, in the report of M.S. Gorbachev which set out, in essence, a strategic program for the new stage of restructuring. The main thing that marked the report was a profound analysis, frankness and constructiveness, a well-reasoned line of argument, a creative character of the proposals and their focusing on solving the problems related to satisfying the urgent needs of the Soviet people. All of this provided an opportunity to elaborate broad and bold decisions. At present it is important immediately to organize a practical implementation of the tasks set out in the resolutions raised by the conference.

What must we focus on particularly in analyzing the results of the conference?

In the first place, the urgent problems were examined comprehensively in relation to the development of the economic base with a reform in the political system. Close attention was given both to economic processes as well as to the role of the political institutions, the spiritual fear, work with the youth and intelligentsia and so forth.

Secondly, of fundamental importance was the confirmation of the party's role as the political vanguard of society. That is, it was emphasized that the party should be the leading political force and not an administrative command one, work in the masses must be carried out through the communists, and the strategy and tactics of restructuring must be determined. In this context, great attention was given to democratizing the life of the primary party organizations and to increasing their role in the development of the socialist self-administration of the people. At the conference there was also a discussion about combining the position of first secretary of the party committee and the chairman of the corresponding soviet.

This is a fundamental and important question. Certainly under the conditions of the separating of functions and a greater role for the soviets, it is essential to strengthen their authority and influence. But the practice of promoting the first secretary of the party committee to chairman of the soviet precisely means his unique confirmation in the position of leader of not only the communists but also the non-party persons. Consequently, the heart of the matter is that at present both the party organization and the soviet can be led only by that communist who receives a mandate of trust from all the workers. This innovation requires a serious restructuring on the part of the party organizations primarily in personnel work. It is essential to indoctrinate and develop true leaders who can go through selection and be elected by the people.

Thirdly, the report outlined a clear path to strengthening the role of the social organizations including the trade unions, the Komsomol and others and to developing socialist pluralism of opinions. The conference recognized the inadmissibility of employing glasnost to the detriment of the interests of our state and society, for promulgating war and violence, racism, national and religious intolerance as well as for distorting and incorrectly using information.

Fourthly, the questions of international relations and international and patriotic indoctrination were among the most urgent at the conference. It was uniformly pointed out that the problems arising in this sphere should be resolved on a truly democratic basis, in line with restructuring and in the interests of strengthening the friendship of all the nation's peoples.

In the acute and principled debate over the fundamental problems of our life as this developed in the course of the discussion of the report and the draft resolutions, one could see the high responsibility of the delegates for the outcome of the changes commenced in the nation.

V.V. Shcherbitskiy went on to emphasize that the conference was a world-scale political event and briefly described its international importance. Many foreign political leaders, in particular, agree in the opinion that the new Soviet foreign policy is closely tied to the domestic restructuring and opens up broad prospects for real progress in the central areas of world policy. Thus, the ideas of the conference are already at work on a level of improving the international situation.

Then the first secretary of the Ukrainian CP Central Committee took up what must be done specifically in the near future. As is known, the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee on 4 July examined certain questions related to carrying out the decisions of the 19th All-Union Party Conference. For discussing the questions of the practical implementation of the measures outlined in the conference documents as well as the proposals and comments of its delegates, it was recognized as essential to convene at the end of the current month a plenum of the party Central Committee. The practical, specific tasks in carrying out the ideas of the conference in our republic will also be discussed at a plenum of the Ukrainian CP Central Committee.

The Politburo of the Ukrainian CP Central Committee has already tentatively examined the range of immediate tasks in organizing work related to the party conference decisions. The work plan will be approved considering the supplements and proposals of the Central Committee sections. At present, as never before, each person on his job should show more initiative, professionalism and tenacity.

It was emphasized that all the communists should study and analyze the conference materials. For this it would be correct to employ the existing forms of political and professional study. The conference delegates, the Central Committee members and the responsible workers should help in organizing this work on the spot, right down to the primary party organizations. Propaganda groups from the Central Committee have already left for the oblasts in the aim of organizing an explanation of the conference materials. At present, it is important to go to the people and meet with them in the labor collectives. Here they should be ready to reply to all questions. The party committees should have a profound knowledge of the political situation in the oblasts, cities, rayons, the labor collectives and among the youth, and in the event of necessity take effective measures to prevent antisocial manifestations and provide a well-reasoned rebuff to bourgeois propaganda.

It is also essential, without waiting and in accord with the conference ideas, to examine and resolve all questions related to the preparations for the report and election campaign. Here the main thing is to provide broad democracy and glasnost in forming the elective bodies and in electing the leading cadres. It was also pointed out that even before the conference, and particularly in the press as well as during the conference, in the

delegate speeches there were numerous critical comments addressed to the party apparatus. The most serious conclusions must be drawn from this criticism. In the near future proposals will be drawn up relating to the structure and to reducing the apparatus of the Central Committee and the local party bodies considering the decisions adopted by the conference to separate functions between the party, soviet and economic bodies. The party apparatus employs highly skilled specialists. Naturally, in the course of the reorganization it is essential to approach each man carefully and ensure the best utilization of his abilities.

At the meeting the question was raised of the need to complete work in improving the management of the republic economy and begin a very crucial task of reforming the political system. Before the end of the year we should actually complete all the measures related to introducing the new general scheme of management and the necessary personnel questions related to this should be resolved. In the second half of the current year and in the first quarter of 1989, it will also be essential to have the Politburo of the Ukrainian CP Central Committee review proposals on amendments in the Ukrainian Constitution as well as other measures to reorganize the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet and the soviets as well as further democratize the electoral system and carry out legal reform.

The questions linked to satisfying the needs of people should be at the center of attention of all practical work. Together with the Council of Ministers it is essential to organize effective control primarily over carrying out the conference decisions in the republic relating to: fulfilling the economic and social development plans, deepening the radical economic reform, protecting the environment, carrying out the assignments of the Food Program as well as seeking out additional reserves for this.

According to the preliminary data of Gosagroprom, the grain harvest is expected to be good as a whole for the republic. The condition of sunflower, beets and other crops is better than last year. In a majority of the oblasts there are real conditions for increasing feed procurement. And this means additional meat and milk. It is essential to systematically analyze the work of the APK party organizations in harvesting the crop, in ensuring the fulfillment of plans for selling livestock and crop products to the state, for increasing output and improving quality of food industry products.

The fulfillment of the plans for building housing, facilities of the social sphere as well as other particularly important national economic projects should also be under constant supervision. Here it is essential to draw particular attention to the quality of construction and to carrying out the measures set in the republic for developing and strengthening the physical plant of the construction industry. It is essential to continue work to seek out additional opportunities for increasing consumer goods production, for broadening services provided to

the public, and for instituting proper order in the organization of public health, trade, in the service sphere, in the municipal economy and in transport.

At present, when the decisions have been taken and the course and tasks have been tested out, success in the matter is determined by the organizational and political work directly among the people. Here before good plans were worked out but their fulfillment was drawn out, it suffered from half-heartedness and was impeded by all sorts of bureaucratic obstacles. For this reason everyone in a bold and tenacious manner and without hesitation should set to work, should respond acutely to manifestations of bureaucratism, irresponsibility and demagoguery; they must complete the commenced, and do everything to carry out in our republic the responsible tasks posed by the party conference.

Participating in the meeting were the delegates of the 19th All-Union Party Conference, the secretaries of the Ukrainian CP Central Committee A.A. Titarenko, Yu.N. Yelchenko, B.V. Kachura, I.A. Mozgovoy, S.I. Kurenko and V.D. Kryuchkov; the heads of the Central Committee sections A.I. Korniyenko, L.M. Kravchuk, P.K. Musiyenko, K.K. Prodan, A.P. Savchenko and A.S. Chumak.

10272

Young Conference Delegate Considers Future Career in Politics

18000551 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
12 Jul 88 p 2

[Interview with Yuriy Surkov, delegate to the 19th Party Conference, by I. Korolkov: "Now We Are All Becoming Politicians"; date and place not given; first two paragraphs in boldface are IZVESTIYA introduction]

There is a saying: The next morning he woke up famous. Yuriy Surkov became renowned when the television program "Vremya" broadcast its report on the fourth and last day of the work done by the 19th All-Union Party Conference. This young delegate requested the floor, and all of us who were glued to our sets watching the events in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses saw and heard the terribly nervous lad launch into the hall the following frank and harsh words: "...there is almost no time left in our conference. And I cannot sit in my place and observe how this time is literally being squandered by certain speakers."

"He hit the bullseye and immediately won over our hearts," stated a brigade-leader of a Moscow plant for treating special alloys, a 30-year-old delegate from the 18th row.

[Question] Was it frightening to go up to the rostrum?

[Answer] Very much so. Physically I felt as if an enormous weight were pressing down on me.

[Question] Your speech was indeed like an explosion. What impelled you to "detonate" that way?

[Answer] Because the self-serving reports by some of the conference's "orators" were depriving us of the opportunity to hear the thoughtful ideas of those persons who had something substantial to say and whose speeches we were impatiently anticipating. It was for this reason that I went up to the rostrum.

[Question] Why didn't you request the floor earlier? You know, such speeches as you mention also resounded during the first day.

[Answer] It took time to see that this conference was a miniature version of our society and to understand that changes for the better are possible only as a result of struggling. It was not so simple to come to an awareness of the following: if I remain silent, everything could swing around and head in a backwards direction.

[Question] Of course, your breakthrough to the rostrum of the party conference evoked respect. But how much grass must have overgrown the path leading to it so that an ordinary speech by a Communist should be regarded as an act of courage?

[Answer] I've also given that some thought. Most likely, the fact of the matter is that other bold fellows have not returned along such a path.

[Question] You said that we don't have enough leaders. Why did you choose precisely this problem to speak about in your very brief presentation?

[Answer] I had anticipated seeing political leaders on the rostrum, but what I saw were business executives crying in their beer. And the following thought occurred to me: if the orators who spoke about anything they wanted except the main thing that was being decided in the hall were genuine leaders, they would not permit themselves to live outside of the times. Society is now entering upon a new period, one during which false authorities are being burst like soap-bubbles, and when the former criteria by which a leading official was judged are being smashed to smithereens. Strictly speaking, even the concept of a "leader" as such did not exist until quite recently. There was specifically the concept of a "chief," a "director," or a "leading official." Like a certificate, the position itself, endowed with a class title, excluded any doubts as to the competence of a nomenklatura staff member, or as to his honesty and decency. It was considered as follows: he exists, and this is something, so to speak, God-given. The unwritten laws which have evolved in the hierarchy of our society have nurtured particular qualities in our leading officials. How are we accustomed to seeing raykom secretaries and ispolkom chairmen? As a rule, they are perceived as cautious, temporizing persons, neither objecting to what their superiors say, nor tolerating differences of opinion from their subordinates. The result is a dead end.

Those enormous qualitative changes which must be accomplished in our society presuppose leaders of a completely different type—rebels of thought, capable of shattering ossified ideas and not afraid to surround themselves with like-minded restless and bold seekers of new things. During the period of nomenklatura secrets, protectionism, and nepotism such persons were not needed. And now there is an extremely dire shortage of them. In my opinion, the society's most important task nowadays is to find such persons and advance them to elective positions.

[Question] But the discovery of leaders is impossible without any overall upsurge of activity among the masses....

[Answer] That's certainly true. We need to tear people away from a condition of the grossest indifference, to arouse in them a sense of their own worth and, so also, a feeling for social activism. Public work which is merely tedious and even repulsive has not challenged anyone in our country. That's because it too frequently was the substitution of seeming activity for genuine work. Furthermore, the person himself played the role of an "extra." And extras are outside of any large-scale social movements. But now it is necessary that people feel a taste for political activity. This is a sensation which cannot be compared with anything else: your own destiny, plus that of your plant and your fellow countrymen, depends upon you personally.

[Question] And have you already felt such a taste?

[Answer] Yes. At the conference.

[Question] Why not earlier? You are both a member of a plant trade-union committee and a deputy of the Moscow Soviet.

[Question] For the same old reason. There are legions of us public officials who are not allowed to be part of the real administration of matters. I am becoming convinced that many of us so-called rank-and-file members of trade-union committees, deputies to soviets, members of raykoms, etc. exist, so to speak, in order to confirm the democratic nature of our sociopolitical system. But we don't exert any substantial influence on matters.

Yes, I am a deputy of the Moscow Soviet. But I feel that I have no real authority or power, but serve merely as ballast. The present-day soviet is a unique kind of mechanism in which the ispolkom and the deputies are like non-meshing gears.

It's difficult to define the feeling which you experience upon attending a session of the Moscow Soviet. People greet you cordially, shake hands with you, chat with you informally on various topics, and you're just about ready

to believe that you and the "masters" of these offices are on an equal footing. But when you mention your request or dispute a decision, you come to understand your true role in this office business.

I had occasion to listen to the speeches made at the sessions by the chairman and the members of the Moscow Soviet Ispolkoms. They were intelligent, well-grounded speeches. But they were not made in order to convince me, a rank-and-file deputy, of their rightness. Because, of course, everything had already been predetermined. And their speeches as well as my voting were all merely a decades-long ritual.

I've been put on the commission for socialist legality. I attend the sessions. It's personally interesting to me. I'm learning a great deal that's new for me. But, after all, this is not really a school for me to attend. I have to set forth ideas, argue, and work. But what kind of ideas and arguments can there be if I'm not competent in legal matters? And there are many persons like me. The ispolkom is beyond our ability to monitor.

Once I attempted to solve a problem, certainly nothing important on a city-wide scale, but important for our plant. How would it be for the workers, I wanted to know, if the cafeteria servicing the enterprise were to be transferred to the latter's balance sheet? There would be improvement in the delivery of supplies and in the quality of the food being cooked. I put this request to the Moscow Soviet Ispolkom. And they turned me down, even though I was already a deputy then. The reason for this rejection was ludicrous: you, they said, would then make life impossible for the ispolkom—you would always be saying things like: give us equipment and provide us with food products.

[Question] So why don't you fight against such operating methods?

[Answer] That's easy to say. I have too little experience, know-how, and, at times, not enough boldness. But the main thing, it seems to me, is that there are no traditions of fighting for something or against something. They are only created.

[Question] The party conference adopted a decision to reform the state's political system. You'll obtain real power.

[Answer] It's a revolutionary decision. So far, not everybody has understood its profound essence right away. And that includes me. I've been thinking about this for several days and am becoming convinced that the variant proposed by Gorbachev is optimally possible under the actual conditions.

On the eve of the conference a great deal was said about dividing or sharing the functions of the party and soviet organs, and here suddenly the raykom secretary and the chairman of the Soviet of People's Deputies will be

embodied in one person. At first I was cautious, but then I understood what this meant. Raykoms frequently issue orders about when the plowing and sowing should be done, but they bear no legal responsibility for their "advice." This is very convenient: to command and not to be responsible. But now the secretary himself will embody the slogan "Implement the party's decisions."

In and by itself, the idea of depriving the party apparatus of the opportunity to simply issue commands without answering for their consequences is not objectionable to me at all. But it's not quite clear how this will fit in with implementing the democratic rights to promote any citizen of the USSR, including even non-party members, to the position of chairman of a Soviet.

[Question] The resolution of the party conference contains the following passage: "Enhancing the role played by representative organs would be facilitated by recommending for the position of Soviet chairmen, as a rule, the first secretaries of the corresponding party committees." "As a rule," but not always.

[Answer] Unfortunately, the experience of our state has shown that if the law contains a stipulation, then only the latter begins to be operative.

[Question] I think that if voters repudiate their trust in a candidate who has already been elected by Communists and put up their own candidate, then nobody should have the power to change the delegates' decision. The entire matter is up to the deputies themselves. The very same resolution records what requirements are demanded of them. They must be "principled persons with a broad state horizon," "capable of actively implementing the rights accorded to them." We've returned again to where we began—citizens' political activism. You, for example, Yuriy, as we've become convinced, are a person who is capable of taking action. But are you able to exercise the rights of a deputy, those of a trade-union committee member, and those of a citizen?

[Answer] Far from always. An amazing thing has occurred. During a very brief period of time the political situation in this country has changed so much that democratic institutions cannot be fully operative at all. People in the mass are not achieving the requirements being proposed for contemporary public life. Speaking about myself, I've never looked into a single legal document. And now I am experiencing a catastrophic lack of legal knowledge and skills. The gap which has formed between what I have been given and what I can do has become simply frightening. In order to fight for one's own rights, workers' rights, and voters' rights, you need knowledge. You won't get far on emotions alone. Only arguments count in disputes and conflicts.

Somehow we've managed to study and learn a few things in the political network. But, to be honest about it, such study does not provide you with know-how. What good

are such skills if you don't use them in practical experience? Just look at what is happening nowadays. For a general reading of economic, philosophical, and historical articles, people take Lenin's works out of the book-cases.

Window-dressing and pomposity are disappearing fast from society. Life is becoming externally simpler and more natural. But also harder.

[Question] You said that you felt a taste for sociopolitical work at this conference. What will you fight for at your plant?

[Answer] For increased wages. We have the possibility of making out work time more compact and taking on additional operations. Second: to see to it that the administration solves our problems not behind closed doors, but together with us. So that we know where our money is going not "after" but "before." So that we think over together what direction in developing the social sphere should be given high priority, and what can wait a bit longer. Third: I will be attempting to achieve an expansion of consumer-type services at the plant. After work people lose a great deal of time waiting in lines. The main thing is to accomplish something real. Having seen the result, many people will appear who will want to help.

[Question] You said that you must convey to your comrades the spirit and the decisions of the conference. What do you have in mind above all: to arouse people to do better work?

[Answer] If we are to speak about the comrades in my brigade, they already do good work. Something else is important here. I would be very glad if I succeed in arousing in our kids an interest in political life.

[Question] So how do you regard the widespread opinion that each person should engage in his own concerns and achieve everything possible in his own situation?

[Answer] I've heard that. It's the way people talk who want to retain their right to decide things without considering broad public opinion. Nowadays workers will not allow themselves to be fooled. They will make the right choice in voting for a leader, and they will do so only after they've listened to and thought about his social program. They will also be prepared to participate in working it out. Today changes in the country are involving us more and more in public life. This process is gathering strength, and even now I would not venture to suppose what political skills we will need tomorrow. I think that they will be very basic ones.

[Question] Yuriy, one last question: what's the main lesson that you've brought away with you from the conference?

[Answer] It's that the destiny of perestroyka depends on each of us: I felt this on my skin when the winds of the stagnant times began to stir through the hall. There's no place to retreat to this time.

2384

Conference Delegates Discuss New Tasks For Primary Party Bodies

18000552 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Jul 88 p 3

[Article entitled: "How to Work Today? What to File Away?"]

[Text] Party Conference Delegates Attend PRAVDA Roundtable Talk on Perestroyka in Party Organization Activities

They entered the editorial premises excited and with a special kind of concentration, still uplifted by the major discussion in which they had participated in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses. These were delegates to the Nineteenth All-Union Party Conference, representing six Belorussian oblasts. Good words were said in the report on the Belorussian experiment. This was inspiring. Extensive work lies ahead! It must be undertaken immediately, without any delay.

How to do this better? What experience to use and what to shelve? These topics were discussed with PRAVDA correspondents by those attending the roundtable meeting. Let us introduce them: N. Igrunov, second secretary, Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee; Ye. Avgustinovich, party committee secretary, Volkovysskiy Sovkhoz; A. Aleshin, first secretary, Grodno City Party Committee; V. Galko, first secretary, Minsk City Party Committee; V. Grigoryev, first secretary, Vitebsk Party Obkom; A. Kamay, first secretary, Gomel Party Obkom; P. Kovalev, fitter at the Gomselmash Production Association; R. Masalkova, rewinding worker at the Mogilev Artificial Fibers Plant; A. Pozyumko, first secretary, Bykhovskiy Party Raykom; V. Razumovich, principal, School No 6, Baranovich; A. Sanchukovskiy, general director, Gorizont Association, Minsk; Ye. Skurko (Maksim Tank), chairman of the board, Belorussian SSR Writers' Union; S. Sharetskiy, chairman, Krasnoye Znamya Kolkhoz, doctor of economic sciences, and others.

And so, they have the floor:

Depends on the Cadres

It was noted at the conference that the new circumstances require a serious updating of party cadre policy. The basic work methods of party committees here must be to organize the training and retraining of cadres and their upbringing, taking into consideration the possible recommendations of leaders, consistent with democratic procedures. In this connection, how do you define your tasks?

N. Igrunov. It would be no exaggeration to say that the conference formulated a huge program for change. This includes a radical reform in the political system, perfecting economic management and ensuring the further development of democracy and glasnost.... These are very broad steps. How to cope with them? Would we engage in jabbering or start skidding? In my view, that is the heart of the matter. Naturally, this makes our party work with cadres even more important and demands the unconditional renovation of the spirit of our time.

Let us consider a most important matter, such as separating the functions of party and state authorities. Why conceal it, today it is not the strongest people who work in the soviets. However, since we are discussing full rule by the soviets, their cadres must be worthy of it. They must be knowledgeable, skillful and initiative-minded. Or else, here is another problem: the autonomy of economic managers. Obviously, we must be concerned with ensuring it, so that every economic manager could be on the necessary level of competence and responsibility.

It is precisely from this viewpoint, it seems to me, that all forms of our work should be considered, even the most traditional. For example, this would apply to issuing references to managers. Increasingly, this form of work is being freed from formalism. What was the situation in the past? All references could be reduced to a set of several standardized phrases, such as "ideologically firm and morally stable." However, there were no discussions in essence. They were approved almost automatically. Now? Some features may be discussed 30 minutes or an hour. The person is subjected to a thorough review. This applies not only to production affairs but to political outlook, to his reading habits and his family. Critical remarks are mandatory, for if they are lacking such references are not accepted.

A. Aleshin. It means a great deal that a reference, before reaching our buro, is discussed by the primary party organization and the labor collective.

V. Galko. This is good educational training. We recently discussed the reference of the general director of the Stroy mash association. The collective had already justifiably remarked to him that sometimes his words did not match his actions. This was confirmed by the gorkom buro members. What happened? Not too long afterwards changes in the director's behavior became noticeable.

A. Sanchukovskiy. Delegates to the conference emphasized that the definitive solution of cadre problems must be based on electoral results. More than 100 managers on different levels, including chief specialists, have already been subjected to the electoral process in our association. Now it is my turn, as general director. Honestly speaking, I am excited, for the people have refused to vote for some of our leading personnel.

27 RETURNING DELEGATES' IMPRESSIONS

A. Kamay. We review annually the cadre reserve in all committees. At each obkom buro session we hear 1 or 2 reports submitted by managers, after a preliminary investigation, followed by a oral survey and sociological studies. All in all, over the past 2 years some 6,500 such reports have been discussed by oblast party committees and primary party organizations. Every month talks are being held in obkom departments with managers of oblast services and departments.

The certification of the party apparatus personnel was completed in all committees; 43 people were recommended for promotion to higher positions and 9 were given conditional certification. Similar work was done with employees of the soviets.

As to elections, they are becoming increasingly widespread, organized on a competitive basis, with two or more candidacies and secret balloting. In the 6 months which have passed since the January CPSU Central Committee Plenum, 3,350 managers have been elected in the oblast. For example, 3 candidacies were submitted to the party group of the Rogachev City Soviet of People's Deputies, for the position of city executive committee chairman: Kondratenko, gorispolkom deputy chairman; Burtsev, chief engineer, communal housing resources; and Shorgin, head of the industrial-transportation department of the party gorkom. S. Shorgin was elected by secret vote taken at the session. Such work must be developed and comprehensively improved, in accordance with the decision adopted at the conference.

A. Pozyumko. It is bad that so far we have not organized, as have the capitalists, a proper system for the training of administrators and organizers, of managers, so to say. At one point this was considered as almost harmful bourgeois influence. Yet management, like any science or art, must be learned. Now we are forced to seek our own answers.

What should they be? Above all, chief specialists at farms should be assigned to practice under the best managers. For example, 4 people were sent to Ivan Ignatyevich Melnik, chairman of the 17-y Partsyezd Kolkhoz, Goretzkiy Rayon. He is a Hero of Socialist Labor and for the past 20 years has worked in that farm. Those assigned to him spent several months in training, after which he gave them most thoroughly weighed references. Three of them were made farm managers and one was considered incapable of holding a managerial position.

The second method of training and supervision is to have the candidate take over from the manager during a most crucial time, when the chairman or the director is on leave. That which a person can accomplish and the type of decisions he makes become immediately apparent.

A. Kamay. The following method is increasingly practiced in our party work. For example, so called reserve months are regularly organized in Novobelitskiy Rayon.

During that time all heads of raykom departments and full time secretaries of primary party organizations are replaced by reserve personnel.

N. Igrunov. Let us particularly mention the party workers. Relieving them from daily economic concerns and from the customary procurement and other daily activities, as decided by the conference, urgently raises the question of intensifying the educational functions of party committee personnel. In this area we must consider and reinterpret a great many things. Some things must simply be recalled, such as the fact that initially, such people were not supposed to be technologists and procurement but political workers. Knowledge of psychology, pedagogy and ability to find a way to approach every individual are extremely important! They have always been important to us but so particularly now, under contemporary conditions.

What is the most important feature of the party worker? Obviously, different opinions could be voiced on this account. I would say the following: love of people. If you do not love people you cannot be a good party worker.

To love means, obviously and above all, to be close to people, to their daily concerns, needs and moods. This leads us to you, Vladimir Viktorovich Grigoryev. We heard that when you became first party obkom secretary, you installed in front of your house a big mailbox with an appeal to people to drop in it their complaints and wishes....

V. Grigoryev. This is a rumor. I have a most ordinary mailbox. The fact that I do not conceal where I live and do not omit even the slightest possibility of talking with the people as I go to work or on my way home, is a different matter. Many people in the city and the oblast already know me by sight.

R. Masalkova. This is indeed important for the party worker to be known by sight. However, it is equally important for me to know people personally. I am a working person. I have been a rewinder for 28 years. It is true that I am also member of the Gorkom Party Buro and member of the republic's Communist Party Central Committee. However, do you know how insulting it is if a manager with whom only yesterday you were sitting side by side in the presidium tomorrow no longer recognizes you at a meeting, or else pretends not to recognize you? In this respect I have always been pleased by the attitude of Vasilii Sevostyanovich Leonov and Nikolay Fedorovich Grinev, our obkom secretaries. Unfailingly they would shake my hand and ask for news. This is not done for official purposes, to show off, but comes from the heart. It is for this sincerity that I respect them....

We already mentioned here the question of the unity between words and actions. You will agree that today this is one of the major problems in the work of party organizations in the training of cadres.

N. Igrunov. Now, when it is a question of implementing the resolutions of the party conference and, essentially, of the fate of perestroika and the future of the party and the country, all of us must adopt the following rule: less meaningless words and more specific actions in order to improve the people's life.

Attending our meeting is also Semen Georgiyevich Sharet'skiy. He is a noted republic scientist. He has headed the department of economics and organization of agricultural production at the Minsk Higher Party School. After defending his doctoral dissertation....he turned to the republic's Communist Party Central Committee with the request to be assigned to a lagging farm.

From the viewpoint of ordinary logic this may seem puzzling. A scientist with a well established position, a successful career, a salary of 500 rubles monthly, with his wife and children well set up.... What would he expect in the new place other than difficulties and discomfort? I know Semen Georgiyevich, and I even tried to talk him out of it. However, he insisted. He wanted to put to practical use the conclusions he had reached in his dissertation. In it he proved that many Belorussian kolkhozes are too small to achieve a rational solution to social problems.

And so he went to a kolkhoz which was by no means advanced. Then another farm, followed by a third and a fourth were added to it.... The result? But let Semen Georgiyevich himself tell you about it....

S. Sharet'skiy. The first two farms which were added to mine and where the new management system was being developed, increased their profits by more than 2 million rubles in 3 years. Today we have four farms and this year two more will join in our experiment.

Essentially, the fact is that we do not reduce perestroika to the solution of production or farm problems alone. I believe that all problems, including social ones, must be solved as a set. We must make greater use of science, for in our country it has become strongly bureaucratized. During the period of stagnation new ideas contained in my article were red penciled. Now science is truly working for us. The proof is that in the past young people were running away from the countryside and now are coming back.

Quite important, in my view, is to give true independence to the peasants and their immediate superiors. Such independence has been frequently proclaimed but, alas, in fact nothing changed. I believe that the resolutions of the 19th Party Conference would help us, once and for all, to abandon what is old and customary.

What is the situation now? For example, let us say that the sowing campaign starts. I go to work and I see that the administration chief from the rayon center is already sitting there. He has made himself comfortable, as though at home. The chief agronomist appears from

somewhere. He is followed by the assigned raykom representative. The question is, why do we need them? They only hinder, they distract us from the work. Some representative of the agroprom would come to me, having worked in agriculture for a week, and he would try to teach me how to do things although I spent 15 years in developing my ideas in my doctoral dissertation. This meant loss of many days and sleepless nights. Can I not find out by myself how to work?

I start trembling when I hear "the rayon level must be strengthened!" As it were, consider that there are 54 agroprom officials for the 25 kolkhozes in the rayon. How much more "strengthening" is needed? Pushers and office loafers are totally unnecessary for us. It is time to consider the appointment of such people to some other, to useful work. Otherwise we shall not be able to surmount bureaucratism.

Where Does the Strength of the Primary Party Organization Lie

The conference reformulated many questions related to the activities of primary party organizations. One could say that the delegates expressed a common interest in making each party organization a truly dynamic political force. In your view, how should this be manifested?

A. Sanchukovskiy. Let us, above all, point out the originality of the situation in which the primary party organizations find themselves today. The situation is complex and unusual. Consider the economic reform. It must be implemented on the run, as they say, while many of the old approaches remain. This leads to breakdowns, losses and conflicts. Our association is scheduled to convert to full cost accounting starting with January 1989. We know that no miracle will happen: January will come and we shall begin to work in the new style, after saying "Happy New Year, comrades!"

What is it that depends on the party organization? As was noted at the conference, the primary party organization is an organic part of the labor collective. Its most important tasks is to base its work on the people, on psychological preparations for the reform, on developing within everyone a feeling of responsibility. For example, there is no need for the party committee secretary to be concerned with all sorts of production difficulties. Work with the people. Teach the people how to act as owners. Learn yourself and teach the party members and, through them, everyone.

A. Aleshin. We have in Grodno enterprises belonging to the same sector: the Neman Shoe Factory and the Spinning Association. They converted to the new economic management principles at the same time. Their rates of output are the same and their working conditions seem to be identical. Why are they different?

One year ago the association's party committee and party members set themselves and, subsequently, persistently solved a specific task: using all forms of organizational-political influence, to prepare the collective and every working person for work under the new conditions. Mass economic training was organized on a firm basis; open meetings, individual talks and certifications took place. The result was that here everyone is clearly familiar with the overall objectives and with what he should do to achieve them. Naturally, results were not slow in coming. The situation at the Shoe Factory is different. Unfortunately, here the party members did not prove to be enthusiastic supporters of mastering the new approaches and things proceeded helter-skelter.

We are trying to intensify our study of the local situation and to single out components for successes and reasons for shortcomings. In my view, we must now pay greater attention to the perestroika experience gained by the primary party organizations, and to disseminate and apply it. The gorkom deemed it necessary to hold two seminars for secretaries of primary party organizations on the basis of the experience of the party organization at the Spinning Association. A description on the experience gained here was presented not only by the party committee secretary but also the party group organizers and brigade leaders.

V. Grigoryev. The primary shop party organizations have a tremendous potential. How to make it available? Answers were given by the conference, which must be speedily refracted in specific practical accomplishments. We must not ignore the rule that the better and the more militant a primary party organization is, the more outstanding and original is its secretary. Such secretaries turn out to be daring and originally thinking and independent people. Are there many such leaders in the primary party organizations? Unfortunately, so far, there have been few.

On one occasion I visited our television plant. I spoke to party members among the workers. I asked them what kind of shop party organization secretary they had? Was he a leader in the collective? I was told that he was not. Why, I asked, did you choose him? It turned out that they chose him because he knew how to draw up various documents and how to chair a meeting. I was interested: Do you have in the shop a party member who is truly respected? Yes! Why did you not choose him? I was told that he was unable to do this or that. He was weak in paper shuffling and gabbing.... Here is what we decided in our oblast: if a party member is unable to cope with his duties as a secretary, the primary party organization has the right and the duty to remove him, without waiting for the next accountability and election meeting. If there is a leader, even if he is rough and difficult to deal with but has authority in the entire collective, it is such a party member who should head the party organization.

However, such "rough characters" do not develop a mutual understanding, to put it mildly, with their administration or superior party committees....

V. Grigoryev. I would put it as follows: for the time being, not always. Perestroika will nonetheless put everyone in his place. It must. For the time being, it is true that gorkoms and raykoms care more for the authority of the economic manager than for that of a party organization secretary. Here is a typical case: unexpectedly, a conflict developed between the party committee secretary and the chairman of the board of the Kolkhoz imeni Suvo-rov, Shumilinskiy Rayon. Essentially, the conflict was about the following: on his return from a meeting of the raykom buro, the secretary summoned the party committee and raised the question of the responsibility of the chairman for the labor conditions of livestock breeders. The latter, however, said that he did not give a damn about the party committee and that he would continue to work as in the past. Instead of holding the chairman strictly accountable, the raykom started to protect this immature manager: he was a good manager, it was said, he had turned a little bit red under the collar, and had showed no restraint. Matters reached the obkom buro.

What was its reaction?

V. Grigoryev. The secretary of the primary party organization was right and we supported him and the party organization. The raykom was strictly reprimanded. Subsequently, at a general meeting, the kolkhoz members relieved the chairman from his position.

A. Kamay. What is still lacking in the primary party organizations is system, concentration, and perhaps a sense of priority. Having noted this, we tried to involve work groups from the obkom and the gorkoms and raykoms to help these units by formulating a system of action for the immediate future and in longer term. We took as a guideline the practices of party organizations of frontranking enterprises. We shall encourage the party members to go on "taking an inventory" of ways and means of work. There is, in our oblast, in each sector so called base party organizations. It is there that new approaches are tried and new models are developed for the activities of primary party organizations under conditions of full cost accounting, self-financing and self-support, and where cadres, including party personnel, undergo training and gain practical experience.

V. Galko. Perestroika must be carried out above all through the primary party organizations. This means that we must be concerned with maintaining their authority and shake them up during periods of stagnation. Let us be frank, in more than 3 years of perestroika this authority has not been strengthened all that much. Why? To begin with, the old trouble is still with us: many of the resolutions, not only those passed by primary party organizations, but even by the CPSU Central Committee, are not being implemented. Second, we are

witnessing a tendency on the part of party organizations to become concerned with their own internal affairs, to "work for themselves," and at best to communicate with the raykoms and gorkoms.

Both the direct and reverse vertical ties between party organizations and committees are weak. What was our situation quite recently? For example, personnel of the superior party committee would show up at the plant. In what role? With rare exceptions, in the role of investigators. We should not hastily blame secretaries and members of party committees or party members for their reluctance to "expose" their own shortcoming or faults, for after such admissions, another commission would arrive, a more authoritative one. The result would be to dress down the secretary. Therefore, the raykoms and gorkoms in particular find themselves at the tail end, merely recording conflict situations instead of preventing them. In our gorkom, on the basis of the study of existing practices, we reached the conclusion that the system of internal party information had to be improved radically.

How did you start?

V. Galko. We set up gorkom work groups in the individual rayons, under the leadership of the heads of departments; we included instructors, raykom personnel and members of the city and rayon party committees. The groups were assigned the task of visiting the primary party organizations every single day, but not to investigate or urge them on, but to help them to reorganize their work through advice and practical steps. There were many rough edges and misunderstandings, for the members of the gorkom initially tried to act "through channels," i.e., they posed and solved on the spot only the type of problems which, based on their kind of department, they had been solving previously. In helping the party members in practical restructuring and eliminating things which were previously required "for reporting purposes," our representatives study from the inside the life of the primary party organizations. Now their leaders as well willingly tell us about the most typical phenomena and events occurring locally. The thus acquired information is summed up by the gorkom on a weekly basis and the picture we obtain is complete.

A. Pozyumko. But could it be that the entire result is yet another weekly document?

V. Galko. I can assure you that such is not the case. The usefulness of this system is great.

P. Kovalev. The less there is paper the more there is work. This is the truth. As a worker, I can prove this with numerous examples. I believe that the entire work of the primary party organization must be assessed according to its accomplishments. Greater attention should be paid to the party groups. Wherever there are strong—in the brigade or the section—as a rule there are no violations

of discipline, the microclimate is normal and literally everything goes well. In those places the primary party organization as a whole is more flexible and militant.

Incidentally, many people sympathize with me: you, they tell me, are both member of the obkom buro, party group organizer and chairman of the labor collective council. Are you not overloaded? The way I see it, however, is that this is a trust and must be valued. But then how could I refuse when last January I was elected chairman of the collective's council? I could not. Incidentally, such a council is a good mate of the primary party organization. Our main concern is to enhance the activeness and dignity of the workers and, thereby, labor productivity and quality. I know that the workers already trust us. This is valuable. We shall set up a party group within the council with a view to increasing its efficiency.

Is this something new?

P. Kovalev. Yes, it is and it is also promising. We can already see that if a problem to be discussed by the council is discussed by the party group the project benefits.

Ye. Avgustinovich. In my view, perestroyka in the primary party organizations must now concentrate on the struggle against the habit we have developed of dealing with everything, of duplicating everything.

Soon after the April 1985 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, our party committee held an expanded session with the rural soviet executive committee and the heads of the public organizations created in the sovkhoz. We were interested in the following: Why were there many measures, meetings and discussions while the situation in the farm was poor? Curiously, when we took a look at the public organizations, it turned out that we had, believe it or not, more than 60. And that is within a single sovkhoz! We decided to close down some, reduce others and merge others again.

The main concern is to enhance the authority of party meetings. At such meetings we hear information on the implementation of resolutions already passed. Incidentally, the information is provided not by me, as party committee secretary, but by those who were instructed to organize and supervise the implementation. At the same time, we report to the party members the steps which were taken relative to their critical remarks.

Naturally, nor do we forget the nonparty people. We use a method such as the home approach. What does that mean? Together with deputies, party activists visit every home, establishing how the people live, what concerns them and what they need. Then the party committee and the executive committee of the village soviet study and sum up suggestions and agree on what should be done,

after which we report to the families on the steps which were taken. The people see that there is real concern for them. They can see perestroika in action.

The way I look at it is the following: unless the people feel that greater concern is shown for them and for their needs, perestroika may come to a standstill. This must not be allowed, as was firmly stated at the conference. Now it is up to us.

Ideology of Renovation

We read in the first resolution that "the conference ascribes crucial significance to increasing the theoretical arsenal of perestroika and the renovation of ideological work, and relieving it from routine, verbosity and cliches, making it consistent with the content and formality of the realities of life and the ability to engage in an honest and frank dialogue with the people on all problems of interest to them." As we can see, these are very serious tasks. What do you think on this subject?

Maksim Tank. Nothing in life is ignored by the human conscientiousness. In order to influence it, however, we need convincing arguments, frankness and truthfulness, and the ability to reach everyone's mind and heart. Let us honestly acknowledge that we do not achieve this at all times. The old and obsolete stereotypes remain strong. They must be surmounted at all costs.

Today great interest is shown in history. Our writers are working extensively on this subject. Occasionally, it seems to me that they even exaggerate. They may take up events that are so old that their investigation is impossible, such as what one prince told another prince.

More recent history, naturally, is more relevant. I am pleased by the publication of works by major writers, which were not published in the past. I am pleased that political journalism has emerged on the cutting edge. All of us must understand better the events of the 1920s, during the Stalinist period and during the period of stagnation.

As everywhere else, stormy discussions are taking place on this subject in our republic. The people speak and write heatedly and passionately. This is understandable. I also understand a certain concern caused by one-sidedness and a subjectivistic evaluation of historical events, which are occasionally encountered. The point is that we are discussing what is most important to us—our attitude toward socialism, understanding socialism and understanding how could it happen that along with the heroic accomplishments by the people, crimes committed against them were also possible.

This was accurately discussed by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev both at the conference and earlier, at the February Central Committee Plenum. We must distinguish between the essential manifestations of socialism and its deformations, between that which was caused "by objective circumstance and that which was the result of subjective factors."

It was rightly emphasized that turning to our history is dictated not simply by the need to turn to the past. We need it vitally in our present work, in order to solve the problems of perestroika. We raised the slogan of "more socialism!" and we must determine what are the values and principles which should be considered truly socialist today.

V. Razumovich. I agree with you. As a teacher, however, I would like to ask you, a literary worker, a question. Naturally, this is not strictly a personal question. It was an instruction given to me by all teachers in our school and even by the entire city. Our literature today needs a positive character. It needs it greatly! I understand that many people, reading these words, would probably grin skeptically. We have heard enough, they would say, in our time of such appeals....

Yes, there indeed were appeals and there were fake heroes. They resembled artificial people—homunculi—who had been raised in a test tube and who triggered absolute mistrust through their untruthfulness and their emasculated and stereotyped characters. But is that what I am talking about now? No, and once again no! The young need a real hero who could trigger a feeling of optimism and would appeal for a harsh and sharp struggle for the sake of the future. Such a person is the focal point of the novel by Vladimir Dudintsev "White Clothing." Other examples could be cited as well. However, so far there have been few such characters. Yet what could be more valuable and important to us than raising the young in the spirit of our socialist ideals?

N. Igrunov. I would emphasize the special role which the school teacher plays in this. The February CPSU Central Committee Plenum accurately stated that the teacher is the most important character in perestroika. I believe that he is the greatest assistant of the party committees in education. For the time being, he is underestimated.

V. Razumovich. The teacher influences not only the children but, through them, directly or indirectly, the parents. We can accomplish a great deal above all in the implementation of party policy. Now, as we go home, I would like to share with all my fellow countrymen the powerful ideological charge of the 19th Party Conference, and the atmosphere of the sharp and businesslike debates which took place at the conference. This is very instructive for all of us. I wish that our party meetings could be like it!

V. Galko. In order to achieve this, the school party organizations must absolutely be strengthened. The "apportionment," which slowed down party enrollment, led to the fact that in many schools today there are no more than 15 or 20 party members, or even less. There are even cases in which all members are retired and no secretary can be elected.

V. Razumovich. Naturally, this situation is obviously abnormal.

Maksim Tank. There is yet another question which should be mentioned: the problem of teaching the Belorussian language in our schools and VUZes. In my view, today the republic's Communist Party Central Committee should pay great attention to this. It is also a question of training cadres of teachers and publishing new journals. What is the situation? In Minsk, it would appear, there is no single school in which all subjects are taught in the Belorussian language. When foreign guests have come to visit us, we take them to schools teaching various subjects in English, French or Spanish but not in our own language. Please understand me correctly: the virus of nationalism is totally alien to the absolute majority of Belorussians. However, the children must know the language of their fathers and mothers....

V. Razumovich. We try to raise our students as patriots and internationalists. A great deal is being done to this effect. For example, we began with letters written by children to their coevals in other union republics and, subsequently, in other countries. The result was the founding of the Planeta International Friendship Club and the creation of a school peace and friendship museum. Many most interesting exhibits have already been collected here. We are in constant contact with the Kumenkartano High School in the city of Heinola, in Finland, and the Krasewski High School in Biala Podlaska, in Poland. We recently welcomed in our school Petr Korshunov and Igor Makhanko, our alumni, soldiers-internationalists who returned from Afghanistan.

In the resolution "On Relations Among Nationalities," the party conference stipulated the following: "The patriotic and international duty of every citizen and every party member is to protect and multiply anything that promotes unity within Soviet society, as the foundation of free development and blossoming of all peoples in the USSR...." It is this concept that will be guiding us in our entire educational work....

Editorial note: we interrupt this discussion before its end. Other relevant problems of perestroika in the organizational and ideological work under contemporary conditions, upgrading the role of the party members, their militancy and their responsibility for the implementation of the resolutions of the Nineteenth All-Union Party Conference were raised in the course of the roundtable talk.

We would like for you, our readers, to take up this discussion at this point. How is your primary party organization operating today? What new features have appeared in the work of the party raykom, gorkom or obkom? How are shortcomings, which obstruct progress, being surmounted? Are words always backed by specific accomplishments?

Many questions exist. In all likelihood, you yourselves would formulate many others related to party life, questions which are of particular interest to you after the party conference and on the eve of the forthcoming accountability reports and elections within the party; argue among yourselves and describe the most valuable experience. We await your letters!

05003

Moscow Obkom Chief Interviewed on Aftermath of Conference

*PM0108153 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jul 88
Second Edition p 2*

[Special correspondent A. Shinkin interview with V.K. Mesyats, first secretary of the Moscow CPSU Obkom, under the rubric "From the Standpoint of the 19th Party Conference": "Leading Rather Than Giving Commands"—date and place unspecified; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] The party conference was hardly over before people began telephoning the editorial office and asking: What are party committees planning to do about the problems discussed? Will the resolutions passed not simply prove to be more "paper boats"? Are Communists and, even more important, leaders prepared to resolve the tasks set? These and other questions asked by our readers basically determined the subject of our conversation with V.K. Mesyats, first secretary of the Moscow CPSU Obkom and delegate to the party conference.

[Shinkin] The saying goes that the wind rocks the sea and rumor rocks the people. But at the moment the words "party conference" are on everyone's lips. And everyone has his own opinion. What would you single out from the party conference resolutions as most important to you, a first secretary?

[Mesyats] I think it would have to be the demand made by the conference that, in content and methods of activity, our party must be a Leninist party in every respect. We must renounce high-handed, dictatorial methods once and for all, conduct our policies through organizational, cadre, and ideological work, and strictly observe Soviet laws and the democratic principles of social life.

[Shinkin] In other words, lead rather than give commands.

[Mesyats] Right. We must learn to lead. Unfortunately, during the long years of the personality cult and the period of stagnation, instead of doing this we mastered the art of giving orders. From the party Central Committee down to the primary party organization we advocated one requirement only: Uncomplaining fulfillment of instructions "from above" to the letter. Instead of collegiality, one-man management prevailed; instead of election to office we had an appointments system; instead of glasnost, strict secrecy; instead of collective discussion and debate, glib truths ready to hand; instead of elected members of a committee, the established unit of the apparatus; instead of direct participation by the broad masses in state administration, their formal assimilation of abstract ideological and political concepts....

Oh dear, there are a lot of these "instead ofs." Basically, any deviation from what was "approved" would be regarded by a higher authority as a malicious breach of party discipline. And all this, I must point out, was called "leadership." Now, in the conditions of democracy and glasnost, we have to revive the real Leninist concept of party leadership. After all, even Dal defines the verb "to lead" as meaning "to govern, advise, and edify." There is nothing there about giving orders.

[Shinkin] While interpreting the past, we are seeking paths to the future and assessing the present. From this standpoint, Valentin Karpovich, what lessons have been learned from the obkom's activity in the first 3 years of the restructuring period?

[Mesyats] There is one feature I can boldly single out: We are moving to an increasing extent away from interference in economic functions. This is now apparent to everyone. But until quite recently it was standard practice in the work of the obkom bureau and secretariat to interfere in production management on any grounds whatsoever. We handed out instructions left, right, and center, as they say—sometimes without considering the real situation and without any sound economic reasons for doing so. We were only interested in His Majesty the Plan. It had reached the point where we were even telling farmers when to plow their land, sow their crops, harrow, and harvest....

All this was indeed true. There is no getting around the fact. Gorkoms and raykoms blindly copied our work. We took satisfaction in noting the strength of our "party influence." But we failed to see how this was an impediment to people, undermined their confidence in their work, and gave rise to social apathy.

The winds of change have had a refreshing effect on us. For the first time in many years we have begun to think about whether or not we are really leaders. And what do people think of our work? We have carried out some sociological research among the oblast party aktiv. A mere 15 percent of the respondents said that obkom workers have given them real assistance. And the rest? They were simply the recipients of our instructions. Even

greater blows have been dealt the system of goading people on by the adoption of the Law on State Enterprise followed by the transition of most labor collectives to working under the economic accountability system. This was when we began to master real political methods of leadership.

The number of resolutions have been reduced and obkom plenums have begun to discuss questions of organizational and political work and cadre and social policy. The obkom bureau is now concentrating its attention on the work style of party organizations and leaders' responsibility for the job with which they are entrusted. A coordination council has been established under the obkom to coordinate the activity of control bodies. The number of checks and visits by various commissions to party organizations was immediately halved. We have regulated the report system and the practice of requesting all manner of information from organizations and we now summon leaders to various conferences and sessions far less frequently.

[Shinkin] But, Valentin Karpovich, is the situation not like the one in the well known anecdote, where the tops of the trees in the taiga are waving in the wind but down below all is quiet? Quite recently I visited a number of collectives near Moscow and heard people saying things along the lines of: What do we signify? Whatever those up top decide, will be. People do not believe in their own strengths or that they are in charge. Is this not where party work among the masses begins?

[Mesyats] Yes, this is where it begins. And if we are going to define the most important aspect of the obkom's work under the new conditions, it is the effort to create an atmosphere conducive to enterprising work by Communists and primary party organizations. By making all the decisions for them, we created a climate of parasitism and lack of faith in their own strengths. Now we are trying to splinter this shell of indifference. On average, members of the obkom apparatus spend roughly 2 weeks per month in labor collectives. Last year, for example, they took part in preparations for more than 1,100 party meetings. The practice of sending out teams of obkom workers to make in-depth studies of the situation at grass roots level and give real help in organizational matters has recommended itself well.

[Shinkin] And what role in this work do you give to labor collective councils?

[Mesyats] It would be ideal if they all took from the party committees and bureaus those powers which are given them under the Law on the State Enterprise. If we are able to engage a force like self-management, it will also be easier for us to organize our work in the new way. At the moment, however, via the Communists in the councils we instill confidence in their members that they are the masters of production with full rights and that the labor collective council can call any leader to account.

[Shinkin] The best barometer to assess the new work style is the state of internal party democracy and the activeness displayed by Communists and every member of the collective. To what point on the scale has the needle risen?

[Mesyats] I will point out what is just a trend at present: Increasingly often the tone is set by whoever works, thinks, and struggles. An offensive has been launched against all manner of abuses and increasingly often social justice comes out on top. The ritual of party meetings, plenums, and our own conferences and aktiv meetings is also changing: There are no more long, empty reports and people speak without preparatory notes and, as a rule, without any paper in front of them at all. They do not criticise objective factors but those personally who are not up to the mark in their work and who are to blame for errors being made. Here are some figures to give you an example. During pre-party conference report sessions by party committees and bureaus on the subject of leadership of the restructuring process, in 58 primary and shop-level party organizations in the oblast Communists rated the performance of elected bodies as unsatisfactory. Some 1,200 members of party committees and bureaus, including 264 secretaries, were not reelected. I cannot remember such a thing happening before, even during a report and election campaign.

The obkom bureau is sticking firmly to the policy of developing everyone's initiative. No sensible suggestion is allowed to go to waste—primarily for this purpose. All critical observations are taken account of. The most important are considered at bureau sessions. Another characteristic feature is that we are now discussing twice as many issues as before as a means of monitoring progress in the implementation of earlier decisions.

[Shinkin] As far as I am aware, Moscow Oblast is famous for its strong cadres. Is this so?

[Mesyats] Yes, that is right. I could give you the names of dozens of leaders I know personally. But there is something I must admit: For too long our selection procedure has been oriented toward people who can create the semblance of being "solid" workers: They have not been judged on their performance but on the number of decisions made and measures implemented, and on the basis of all those upbeat reports. For decades these nomenklatura workers have moved in leading circles. Fortunately, however, bad specialists are no longer retained: They are rejected by their own labor collectives. Take G. Kolesnikov, for example, former director of the "Selkhozavtomatika" Engineering Center. A peremptory man by nature, used to ignoring the opinion of the collective. And you know what? At the beginning of the year the collective gave him a vote of no confidence and he had to say goodbye to his cozy leadership post.

In many party organizations the process of forming the reserve is now a public affair which takes account of the opinions of Communists and labor collectives. The Naro-Fominskiy Raykom, for example, analyzed the state of the cadre reserve. It turned out that people certainly do not assess the practical qualities of the reserve as stipulated in the documents. So a list of candidates for the positions was published in the rayon newspaper. The composition of the reserve was then revised on the basis of the results of the rayon "referendum."

We are becoming increasingly bold in our assimilation of the practice whereby leaders are elected by secret ballot. More than 1,000 economic, party, and Komsomol workers have been elected recently. Under these conditions you no longer give orders even if you would dearly like to. There is a real contest of intellect, practical qualities, and ability to work with people.

[Shinkin] Addressing the party conference, Valentin Karpovich, you noted that in Moscow Oblast new forms of socialist economic management are being broadly introduced. Are they contributing to the appearance of new forms of party work?

[Mesyats] It is a complex problem. Collaboration between party bodies and cooperative workers is a delicate business. It is only just beginning to take shape. We do not have much experience in this at the moment. Perhaps the only firm link in the chain is the Communist in the cooperative. We are devoting special attention to the selection of cooperative leaders. It is all going to take time. With regard to changes in the industrial sector, you could say that here the relevant forms of party influence have been more or less defined. For example, working on the basis of present conditions, the Ramenskoye Gorkom has formed a council of party organization secretaries from enterprises and organizations incorporated in the "Ramenskoye" Agro-Industrial Committee. The gorkom secretary is head of the council. This body helps to coordinate the activity of the various party organizations.

Incidentally, collaboration between party bodies and new forms of socialist economic management is a task not only for the practitioners but also for the theoreticians of party building. For some reason, however, they are in no hurry to come to our assistance. Despite the fact that we now need mutual efforts.

[Shinkin] And is the same true of work with the soviets?

[Mesyats] On the contrary, before we join forces here we must be decisive about demarcating functions. We have to revive soviet authority and strengthen deputies' independence and self-reliance. We are already doing something in this direction. Last year we almost halved the number of joint resolutions. We are trying to do away with them altogether in the not too distant future. But,

on the other hand, we are doing our utmost to enhance the monitoring of work done by the soviet apparatus and increase the personal responsibility of Communists working in this apparatus.

[Shinkin] At the party conference, Valentin Karpovich, you spoke in favor of combining the posts of soviet chairman and first secretary of the corresponding party committee. Would this not contradict what you have just said?

[Mesyats] Certainly not. As I see it, this would enhance soviets' control functions and strengthen their authority by giving it the weight and power of party influence. Then, it seems to me, we would have a real democratic mechanism. The first secretaries of party committees will become dependent on the broad masses of working people. Their position will depend not only on the opinion of the elected aktiv but also on their authority among the people. Really talented, competent, honest people of principle will thereby be promoted to the position of party leader.

[Shinkin] Glasnost. Does it help you to lead or to give orders?

[Mesyats] To lead—no doubt about that! Broad glasnost and objective, constructive criticism not only smash obsolete approaches but also create new ones. For example, everyone has now heard of "Mosoblselstroy Trust No. 18." People are coming from all over the country to study its experience, which has been approved by the CPSU Central Committee. What has helped it to make effective use of the principles of economic accountability

and self-management? Its own newspaper, ZA KOLLEKTIVNYY TRUD, which came into being on the initiative of the obkom. For the collective, for whom the thorny path to the contract system lay in persuasion by action and was accompanied by furious argument, the newspaper has invariably served as a mobilizing factor and contributed to restructuring people's way of thinking and cultivating a constant need in them for creative work.

Incidentally, despite the information boom in the central press, the authority of the local press in the oblast is also growing. The newspapers' circulation is increasing. It has grown by 30,000 copies since the beginning of the year. The secret is simple. Party committees are no longer overseeing the editors. The latter are not required to agree critical material with them, but very principled demands are made on objectivity and accuracy. The obkom propaganda section and press section constantly monitor the effectiveness of newspaper items.

[Shinkin] Valentin Karpovich, allow me to ask: What style do you personally maintain in your own work?

[Mesyats] A very pertinent question. There is no point in being hypocritical—for many years we have all worked under the conditions of a heavy-handed administrative style. As I have already said, we were taught to do this and it was required of us. This means that restructuring does not come easily. Sometimes we have to take painful measures. But I realise that there is no other way, that times have changed and different things are required of us. And experience confirms that the new approaches in style of leadership are the most effective. We will make sure they are established in practice.

SOVETSKAYA KULTURA Readers React to Conference Speeches, Resolutions

18000544b Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 7 Jul 88 p 1

[Article by G. Terekhova, Readers' Letters desk editor, under the rubric "From the Recent Mailbag": "By the Dictates of Conscious, With Total Dedication!"]

[Excerpts] Only a few hours after the conference began its work, our newspaper started receiving responses to it—we received many letters, cables, and telephone messages; readers called the editorial office to share their impressions of the report and individual speeches, and they joined battle with the speakers. The last element in these responses is that rapture with which letters to the editorial office used to open on similar occasions in the past. People speak openly and soberly, without concealing the questions arising, and at times their anxiety also. This is the best testimony that people are well aware of the entire responsibility of the time in which we are living. [passage omitted]

There can be no doubt that the main question discussed at the conference was that of the party's role as the political vanguard of society. It was raised in the report and it echoed in many of the speeches. It can be said without exaggeration that the letters from our editorial office mailbag on the party's role are the sharpest and the most impassioned. "Why is it," Muscovite Maya Kolina writes, "that when bringing to light the excesses in the country's leadership and criticizing aspects of our former leaders' characters, there is absolutely no mention of the following detail: Where was the mighty Central Committee apparatus, why did nobody draw the party comrades' attention to their errors? Why is it that even now all our hopes (and this is echoed in the speeches by some delegates) are more often than not linked to M.S. Gorbachev's personality? We need structures which would render impossible any dependence on the ill or good will of the leader, on his intellect or incompetence."

The party's authority will be seriously tested in the conditions of glasnost and democratization, which will be further developed after the conference as a result of the reform of our political system. As M.S. Gorbachev said in the closing speech: "The party's leading role in the new conditions will be determined entirely by the real authority which has to be won anew every time by means of specific deeds."

It was of course the forthcoming reform of society's political system that generated the largest number of responses. Not all readers are unanimous on this point; their letters contain many doubts and much wavering... Candidate of Philosophical Sciences V.N. Lysenko, senior lecturer at the MAI [not further identified] Scientific Communism Department, deems it necessary to launch without any delay a discussion of the draft reform of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the electoral system and to begin right away preparations for next spring's

elections to the country's supreme organ. Readers assume that its authority will be backed by the authority of the party and its leaders. It all boils down to one thing: "Restructuring will result in the creation of a state of the people, in other words, a state belonging to the people, a state, moreover, where increasingly broad strata of the people will themselves act as bearers of state power." (Colonel, retired, A. Riotto, CPSU member since 1972, Rovno).

The determination to deepen the radical economic reform, which sounded both in the report to the conference and in the speeches, was welcomed by readers with great approval. The reform is still bogged down and the main enemy here, in the opinion of most of those who wrote us, is bureaucracy and the edict-based methods of economic management it preserves. "Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev is right," Leningrader L. Kalmykova writes, "the 'fist' method of combating bureaucracy is ineffective. It is necessary to create such conditions in the economy as would simply leave no place for bureaucracy within it." But readers also express the following fear: Will the bureaucracy not derail the actual creation of such conditions? After all, it has managed to virtually "disarm" the Law on the State Enterprise. And how about the various obstacles erected by different departments in the path of leasing contracts and cooperative activity! Even speeches by conference delegates—V. Starodubtsev, V. Postnikov—make it clear that the really new and revolutionary changes are making their way across bureaucratic and departmental barriers only with help from the highest offices and at times from the general secretary himself. "Much was said at the conference about the braking mechanisms in the economy; virtually none of the speakers avoided this, but these were still general words and appeals. Where are the specific measures—precise, clear, with firm schedules for execution—on radical cutbacks in the apparatus, on the curtailment of its powers?" engineer N. Tshchenko writes from the city of Mytishchi. [passage omitted]

/12232

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Readers Air Views on Conference Decisions

18000584a Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 8 Jul 88 p 1

[Roundup of readers' letters: "Perestroyka: A Matter for Everyone"]

[Text] The decisions of the 19th All-Union Party Conference are today rightly occupying a central place in the spiritual life of troops of the army and navy because they affect the radical interests of all the people and are opening up new opportunities and ways to deepen perestroyka. This thought is the leitmotif of the letters arriving at the editorial office from our readers. We publish some of them below.

"How Dare You Criticize..."

In heated discussions on the party conference questions concerning the activity of the party organizations were posed in a new way. And straightaway it was said that now it is necessary to revive in full measure in the party an atmosphere of principledness, openness, debate, criticism and self-criticism, discipline, party comradeship and unconditional personal responsibility and the businesslike approach.

If we talk about our party committee here at the Pacific Ocean Higher Naval School imeni S.O. Makarov, then this revival is proceeding with difficulty. Not long ago, for example, a party meeting was held in the department of combat communications. It was businesslike and sharp, and the communists assessed their work self-critically and addressed criticism at the school leadership. But in the meeting resolution we wrote the following: "Perestroika at the school has not been initiated and the command-pressure style of leadership persists in the training and indoctrination program and the activity of the party organization." We did not reach that conclusion lightly and are prepared to substantiate it from all positions with specific proofs.

And then it started. Two days later the chief of the political department at the school, Capt 1st Rank G. Kalitko, gathered together some of the chiefs of department and the secretaries of the party organizations, with no advance notice of the reason for the meeting. He started to ask questions, and then we could see which way the wind was blowing. And finally, after reading the resolution adopted at our party meeting he asked angrily: "How dare you criticize the school in general while you yourselves do nothing?"

There followed a second stage involving a "secret" investigation of the work of our department. This year the examination pass rate for course students has been low. And this can be explained: the department has raised its requirements with regard to student training. But there is no increase in knowledge at the school because to this day no appropriate method of special training has been organized; the communists in the department have raised this matter with the command. Notwithstanding, this situation was used for a quite different purpose than it formally should be and at the end of it all the department chief, Capt 1st Rank V. Gubenko, and certain officials were punished. When this was going on no one showed any interest in the opinion of the communists or of the secretary of the department party organization.

(signed) Capt 2nd Rank L. Sirotin, secretary of the department party buro.

You Cannot Cover the Waste with Words

I am putting off the day when I have to write the references for the officers who graduated from the Ulyanovsk Higher Command Academy imeni G.K. Ordzhonikidze. "Does not know," "is incapable," "is reluctant"; there will be many such formulations, for example, in the references of Lieutenants I. Krotov, N. Dolgikh and I. Yegorov. Because they cannot work with people; well, you will not receive this kind of practice at the school. But they sometimes are incapable of elementary things, both on the plane of knowledge of technical communications facilities and on the plane of organizing exercises. Each of these lieutenants has to have an experienced captain standing there like a nursemaid. But the captain has his own duties, his own responsibilities for his assignments.

It is most likely that at this school they also talk a great deal about the need to improve the qualitative parameters in training for course students. Is it not high time to move on from words to deeds? For waste cannot be covered with words, and in the troops it immediately becomes obvious which VUZ really cares about quality and where fine intentions are still marking time.

Sharp words, perhaps, but check it—it is urgent. Just read the materials of the 19th All-Union Party Conference and like my own words I read the following: "The conference demands consistent and accelerated implementation of the reform of the secondary and higher school"; this is stated in one of the resolutions. I suggest that this demand will be embodied in specific measures that will be undertaken to deepen perestroika in the higher military school also. It is impossible to reconcile ourselves to its present condition. It is a question of the quality parameters of combat readiness.

(signed) Lt Col V. Sukhorukov, Volga Military District.

From the Positions of the Law

Today we have every justification for saying that the decisions of the 19th All-Union Party Conference are providing a powerful impetus for improving the legal guarantees for perestroika and are a basis for the formation of a socialist legal state. Very much work needs to be done in this direction. And as we draft the first outlines of practical plans I would like to say the following.

In order to insure the absolute supremacy of the law in all spheres of our life, including army life, it is essential to change a great deal in the public awareness. And first and foremost it is essential to improve people's legal knowledge and arrange things so that from their early years all citizens acquire legal knowledge in the closest and most direct way.

In the army and navy, too, it is impossible to get by without general compulsory legal education. For what do we see now? In officers' testimonials we now virtually never see even modest references to the level of their legal competence. One of the most important characteristics that should be considered on a mandatory basis when making appointments to leading posts is essentially not monitored.

One direct consequence of this shortcoming, and sometimes even open legal nihilism, is, for example, the fact that year after year a large number of complaints are received by the military procurator's office at our garrison about incorrect actions by officials. Most often the rights and interests of citizens are being infringed upon when decisions are made about questions of dismissal from work and when people are held administratively or materially liable, and in labor disputes.

And what happens most often is that a particular commander or chief cannot find the time to check that his actions are legal, and does not even suspect that they involve some legal standard. In my opinion, in such cases it is apropos to raise the question in general of the professional suitability of the leader.

However, we also recognize that to some extent a disdainful attitude toward the law sometimes also stems from the fact that some department instructions are obviously at variance with today's realities in life. Even, for example, something as insignificant as a military unit acquiring office supplies now involves an entire problem because only a risible amount of cash can be made available: no more than R2 per purchase.

We think that these anachronisms and imperfections that slow us down should not exist in the legal state. Petty regulations at each step are not essential in order to observe legality.

(signed) Lt Col of Legal Services V. Pochtarev.

War on Bureaucracy

I read the 19th All-Union Party Conference resolution "On the Struggle against Bureaucracy" and I thought: that is what we need today. Need very much! Without a broad offensive against the bastions of bureaucracy everywhere we shall not advance perestroika further.

This also applies in full to our army life. For it also happens with us that a hundred papers must be written just to resolve some insignificant problem. Sometimes it is absurd. At one air force garrison I happened to handle a document that was extremely indicative in this regard, namely, a report written for the commander of a regiment by a company commander. The junior officer had asked his senior to allocate a bulldozer for work on a supply point. The report included approval from six (!!!)

officials giving their instructions to their subordinates on the allocation of the bulldozer. And the final signature was that of the soldier: "I cannot do the work because the bulldozer is out of action."

The question immediately arises: are these intermediate elements necessary since they merely give instructions but carry no responsibility for fixing the equipment? What is the sense in this procedure for resolving these matters when the last word still remains with a specific executor—who is often poorly trained and not always disciplined and responsible?

It is a familiar picture: the business moves like this bulldozer, but a whole stream of paper moves about with increasing speed, the revolutions increase, and much depends on this.

I think that following the adoption of the decisions at the party conference we must once and for all overpower this misshapen progeny of the time of stagnation. And in my opinion, we must start to follow the party line in the army by implementing a profound, well-considered, comprehensive and sound organizational and staff reform and a decisive reduction in duties that have little effect on the business to hand but instead produce paper and resolutions.

In this connection I would like to touch on a "delicate" matter. In the management apparatus there are sometimes people who at meetings and gatherings and assemblies literally "sit" on the texts of all kinds of statements on training for the leading wing. I think, first, that this is a sign of laziness and haughtiness in leaders. Second, it is proof of their incompetence in matter "vital" to themselves. Third, it is an indicator of double-dyed bureaucracy.

It is time to put an end to it.

(signed) Col V. Ponomarev, Belorussian Military District.

09642

Izvestiya Runs Readers' Letters on Party Conference

18000598 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
17 Jul 88 p 2

[Article entitled: "From the editor's mail"]

[Text] It has been only two weeks since the end of the 19th All-Union Party Conference. IZVESTIYA's letters to the editor take us back to those days. The readers write under the fresh impression of the reports, speeches, resolutions and the whole atmosphere of the party conference. It is typical that the majority of those reacting to

this event are writing not so much about problems that directly affect their enterprise, city or family as about the most central political matters that were discussed at the conference.

The line for further democratization of the party and our whole life and the transformations proposed in the economic and social spheres are so substantial that a certain amount of time and a broad exchange of opinions are necessary to analyze them in detail.

The Authority of the Soviet Will Rise

The perestroika going on in the country affected my personal life too. Three years ago I, an historian by education, left the office for the factory floor. At the age of 30 I became a foundry worker and a Communist—last October I was accepted as a candidate member of the CPSU.

I am judging the policy of the party now as a former office worker, as a Communist and as a laborer. In addition I am a propagandist at the plant... My comrades and I expected a great deal from the 19th Party Conference. Unfortunately we were late in reading the newspapers: when the mail arrived we were at the plant. Anxiety, hope and impatience characterized our feelings. Finally we acquainted ourselves with the speeches of the delegates and the resolutions and, as the saying goes, we breathed a sigh of relief. My hopes were justified, and not mine alone.

It is true that at first there were disputes among the workers about the fact that the first secretary of the corresponding party committee would be elected as the chairman of the soviet as a rule. I too gave a lot of thought to this, read and re-read the resolutions, speeches and explanations by M. S. Gorbachev on this subject. And I came to the conclusion that at the present stage of perestroika this is the most sensible decision. It raises the authority of the soviet and increases control over the work of the ispolkom. Up to now we rank and file workers and party members know very little about what the chairman of the ispolkom or that same secretary of the raykom does. Their activity is known, if at all, only to a small circle of ispolkom or raykom workers. Now the situation will change radically inasmuch as the leader will be continually in the public eye. His actions and results can be assessed not only by members of the party aktiv and not only by party members but by all people. Conditions for abuse of power will disappear. He will be accountable to the party committee that recommended him, to the soviet that elected him and to every voter.

No, people today are not going to vote mechanically. I became convinced of this from the example of our plant, when the council of the labor collective and its chairman were elected. The conference of the electors lasted for four days and up to midnight. In the final analysis neither the plant director nor the secretary of the party

committee, who was not able to think independently, wound up in the council. After many hours of discussion a talented designer, an authoritative person with principles and his own opinions, was elected chairman of the council of the labor collective.

Democracy works. And I am certain that the election of the first secretary as the chairman of the soviet of people's deputies by secret ballot will stimulate the activity of the leader, and the deputies themselves will work more actively. Thus the conference lived up to my hopes.

A. Shomas, foundry worker at the cutting tool plant, Tomsk

Without Standoffishness, Frankly

I was glued to the television set during the party conference. For the first time in my memory we were witnesses to such a lively, unsimulated discussion. There you have the effect of perestroika! Standoffishness, the indispensable kow-towing to the speaker and endless quotations all disappeared.

It was gratifying to see how right before one's eyes truth was born in stormy disputes, how additions and corrections came from all sides. This was precisely the vital creativity of the masses that has been urged on us so long in speeches without, however, giving us the opportunity to exercise it.

The conference showed something else, however: a lack of the ability to discuss. It is one thing not to agree with someone's point of view and quite another not to permit the speaker to finish his statement. It was very upsetting when the audience interrupted the speeches of certain delegates. If it were not for the principled position of M. S. Gorbachev we simply would not have been able to hear a number of important and necessary things. At the same time the exchange of remarks between the presidium of the conference and the speakers and audience made it possible to understand better the political platform of many delegates, to tear them away from the memorized text and force them to explain the very essence of the question.

We only regret that we did not hear all of the presentations in full. Reading the newspaper text, you must agree, does not give a full impression of the emotional heat, the audience reaction, etc.

It is likely that the first such experience in broad glasnost simply could not be completely successful. We are waiting for direct broadcasts from the upcoming plenary session of the CPSU Central Committee and other meetings and conferences that are important for the country. And the main thing is to have the local television studios follow the example of Central Television.

After all, sometimes we know more about what is going on in the center than right beside us. The lesson in openness taught at the party conference should not be forgotten.

A. Obsushnyy, Odessa

Meetings Are Necessary

I am making a suggestion: each delegate to the 19th All-Union Party Conference should be required to meet with the party members on behalf of whom he was selected to go there. Let him give an account of himself, explain his position on the questions that were discussed and listen to the opinions of the party members. Thanks to these meetings there will be a general exchange of opinions in the party and a partial referendum.

The meetings should be held in place of the July party meetings that are planned in the primary party organizations. It is important that everyone be involved in party affairs.

L. Polyakov, Soligorsk, Belorussian SSR.

Organizer or Functionary?

At present the administrative apparatus is being reduced. And this is quite correct, since under the stagnant system where "one came with a plow and seven with spoons" we were headed into a dead end. In this connection a question arises: are the inflated trade union staffs necessary?

At large enterprises trade union workers are provided with sinecures, offices, upgraded housing, bonuses, trips not to a boarding house but to a sanatorium and higher pay than any engineer. There is no objection to providing a stimulus for good work. But the question is, just what is this work? The struggle for organizing competition? But we know how low its efficiency is. As far as improving working conditions the administration basically takes care of this, and the trade union workers more often than not just tag along. The same applies to the distribution of housing: the opinion of the management is formalized as the will of the trade union organization. What is left? Technical paper work, handing out banners, certificates of honor, etc. I know this from personal experience: for eight years I was in the shop committee and for five years I was the trade union group organizer. This is why one is forced to the conclusion: it is not necessary to duplicate functions and create excess staff units that do not furnish any real return.

L. Rumyantseva, Podolsk

If Not Unanimously

The sessions of the USSR Supreme Soviet are being broadcast on television. The very fact of direct broadcast already testifies to the expansion of glasnost in the work

of our highest executive body. This is good. But there still is not enough democracy. The television cameras pointed this out. For example, the presiding officer raises questions for voting and asks in a monotonous voice: "Who is 'in favor' ... 'opposed' ... 'abstains'?" Almost without looking at the floor and especially not at the seats in the presidium (where deputies are also sitting!), he announces the results of the voting: "Unanimous." Can he in a fraction of a second encompass with his glance the whole enormous hall in which hundreds of deputies are sitting and determine the results of the voting? I doubt it.

At the recent party conference there was much more democracy. People voted against the motion, abstained from voting and openly spoke about the motivations for this. But now the imperfection of the mechanism of voting itself and counting the votes has become obvious. There is a need for a new technical approach. And I propose: install three buttons in the seat of each participant in the voting: "in favor," "opposed" and "abstain." Set up a large display in the hall to show the results of the voting, possibly indicating the seat numbers. The deputies would vote by raising their hands and at the same time would back up their opinion by pressing the appropriate buttons.

A. Davydov, serviceman.

A Sober Analysis Is Needed

We are witnessing the renaissance of public opinion. One would like to believe that the times of feigned unanimity are past. The party conference set the tone for an analytical approach to the solution of the problems that are most important for our country. Experience will show how optimal the decisions that were made really are. It is possible that life will make some corrections - this is a normal process.

In particular the process of delimiting the functions of the party, the soviets and economic organs needs to be thought through very carefully.

V. Vilin, construction engineer, Sochi.

Why Should Aeroflot Have a Ministry

Radical economic reform, and many delegates at the conference talked about this, demands persistence, boldness and the ability to look at familiar things in a new way. To look at things primarily from the economic standpoint. We, employees of the institute of civil aviation, consider that in our situation where there is only a single airline, Aeroflot, maintaining an entire ministry (Ministry of Civil Aviation) for this airline is not appropriate. After all, Aeroflot is one of the links in the transportation system of the country (for the coordination of the operation and development of which a

unified ministry of transportation is probably necessary). Therefore Aeroflot, in our view, should be managed by a commercial body - a council of the directors of the aviation enterprises and headed by an elected general director of Aeroflot. All of the administrative personnel of Aeroflot should be hired by the council of directors and maintained from a share of the profits of the aviation enterprises to be determined by it.

This will make it possible to reduce substantially the enormous administrative apparatus and to ensure the financial independence of the aviation enterprises and their genuine interest in the results of their work.

G. Korol, V. Yevsinov, Ye. Drozdov, etc. - in all 24 signatures, Moscow.

Emergency Whitewashing

The spirit of the conference was marked by a business-like approach and the absence of bombast, which one can only welcome. After all, it is no secret that window dressing and the refined ability to pass off the desired for real are the very phenomena of the era of stagnation that brought us so much harm. It is obvious, however, that they put down deep roots, and to this day we are not able to rid ourselves of them. I remember a story that amused all the inhabitants of our town this spring. At an urgent, almost emergency tempo our town was put in tip-top shape, especially along the highway. Sausage, hot dogs and butter appeared in the stores - and at state prices, which is interesting. We did not believe our eyes: had perestroika really come to us? No, it turned out to be something much simpler: there was hurried preparation for the arrival of one of the leaders of the republic, the chairman of the Council of Ministers, V. Masol. V. Masol passed through - and everything went back to the way it had been.

M. Petrenko, town of Otynya, Ivano-Frankovsk oblast.

12893

PRAVDA Surveys Readers' Letters after Conference

18000608a Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Aug 88 p 2

[V. Grishin report: "We Are Not Looking for the Easy Life"]

[Text] A month has passed since the 19th All-Union Party Conference but people are still talking about it, reflecting on it, arguing about it. And this is understandable, for the conference was a major, unprecedented event in the life of our party. It dealt with the entire range of problems facing our country, and it outlined a further program for action. The PRAVDA editorial office has received hundreds of comments on this event.

First and foremost our readers note the unusual atmosphere in which the conference took place. All of us, they write, were witnesses of a real and open discussion and we could see that on the dais, in the lobbies, and in their conversations with journalists, the delegates felt free and at ease. It so happened that during the speeches they were asked questions, and then a lively dialogue started, which as a rule deepened and enriched the thoughts of the person speaking. "In the evening when the program 'Vremya' started," writes assembly worker S. Ryazantsev from Chelyabinsk, "the city streets were literally deserted; everyone was at home watching television. If I am not mistaken, the only time that this had happened before was when they were showing the television serial 'Seventeen Moments in the Spring.'"

The atmosphere of broad glasnost, unknown at previous party forums, in and of itself promoted a combative and working mood.

"If we think about it, what occurred was a powerful and unexpected dash forward along the road of the democratization of society. It was guaranteed by the honest and passionate voices of the 5,000 conference delegates—workers, kolkhoz farmers, members of the intelligentsia" (A. Obratsov from Leningrad city). "Despite the pluralism of opinions being asserted in society, the delegates were united in thinking that perestroika is as necessary as the air and that we have not and cannot have any other choice." (Yu. Nechayev, propaganda worker from Ussuriysk city, Maritime Kray). "The conference was an October Revolution in the minds of the people of the Eighties" (V. Vasilyev, officer, communist since 1981, Crimean Oblast).

The leitmotif ran through all seven of the resolutions adopted by the conference that perestroika is the living creation of the masses; it is not something dreamed up but has been born out of the sufferings of life itself. The true motive force of perestroika and its sponsor and recognized leader reflecting the basic interests of the people and of socialism is the party.

Although the positive trends are obvious, no real change has yet been accomplished. Ye. Yermenko from Kharkov exposes this with absolute frankness. He writes the following.

"Three years of perestroika. We have read in the newspapers the figures for national income growth, labor productivity and so forth. But for the rank-and-file worker these are distracting concepts. Little has improved in a concrete way. There used to be no meat in the stores, and there still is no meat. Bread has become more expensive and the promised improvement in quality has also not materialized. Manufactured goods have also become more expensive because of the zealous 'erosion' of the cheap range and changes in the indexes. Services have become more expensive. The state cafes have closed and we are transferring the premises to the cooperative people, but the meals have tripled in price."

Everyone wants to feel the practical results of the ideas of perestroika not in the remote future but today and tomorrow. The main hope here is the radical economic reform. It is not happenstance that readers are asking the following: "At the conference there was sharp criticism of Gosplan, the sector ministries and the Ministry of Finances; why then have the leaders failed to respond to the criticism and explain their positions?"

"Perhaps I missed it, but tell me if comrade Murakhovskiy spoke during the discussions," writes Burdin from Kislovodsk. "If he did not speak, that is a pity. The chairman of the country's State Agro-industrial Committee is obliged to say candidly what it is that is hampering us in quickly resolving the food problem." A nonparty worker from the Dneproplastmass Production Association (Dnepropetrovsk), V. Kuzemko, asks with a sense of reproach and regret: for how long will we have gasoline trucks using 30 to 50 liters for each 100 kilometers, wretched tractors, overweight combines and unsuitable electronics? We are seriously behind leading countries. In the opinion of Kharkov engineer S. Shevchenko this is the result of weakness in the sector management structure: "We are still living with the illusion that it is possible to straighten out the work of the ministries and then you immediately have perestroika. Vain hopes!" In the opinion of this reader bureaucracy and limited possibilities are built into their functional design. This is how his letter ends: "Time will not wait. But the people are waiting! So let the boldness and decisiveness of engineering thinking accompany perestroika!"

Probably the main thing here is not whether or not there should be sector ministries but that they should not hold back perestroika and should help to shape a new economic mechanism and bring the ideas and principles of the economic reform to the labor collectives and every worker.

The letters contain many questions.

"Previously we lived through nature. In general we lived well. Then the 'storeys' went up and people had more money. But tell me, for how much longer can our economy be maintained on consumerism?" Thus reasons M. Stepanov from Mogilev. If, he continues, we are powerless to initiate changes tomorrow, how can we expect to resolve what has been outlined for the day after tomorrow? And here are some more questions posed in the letter. "Why have the comments made about certain ministries in the speech of V. Kabaidze remained unanswered?" "They say that the ministry apparatus has been cut by tens of thousands of people but few have gone to work in production. So was it worth making this reduction?" Every letter ends with this wish: comrade ministers, speak out in newspaper articles, give interviews to journalists; you must respond to the questions raised for you by the conference delegates.

Of course, the success of perestroika does depend largely on the ministries, the planning organs and the center. But it depends no less on the labor collectives, on each of us. An inhabitant of Sharya city in Kostroma Oblast, labor veteran N. Shorin said it well: "People know how to live well, work honestly and receive their just deserts. The idle ones chatter, those who work are silent. Let us roll up our sleeves, comrades, and set to work! This was my mood after the conference."

This is the mood of most Soviet people. But how to work? It is no longer possible to work as we did previously. No one is about to give us anything; our own labor is the only guarantee of prosperity.

The letters are written in simple human language. Their authors speak with great warmth of the fact that our people are working people, sensible and honest people who are not looking for the easy life. No one wants to steal from the state or deceive it, and no one is about to do so if each person knows that he is working for himself and yields up a reasonable share to develop his own socialist motherland. If we all, down to the last person, work diligently, cherish the country, and spend our money sensibly then we shall become rich. If we work badly we shall be poor. "We have already praised ourselves enough. We should say less about the tasks and do more to solve them in a practical way. More modesty and more diligence in our work!" This is the call from designer V. Pesotskiy from Dnepropetrovsk.

In order for us to do better on all sectors it is essential to organize people and interest them in highly productive labor, and organize the work of lease and contract collectives. It is necessary to reward good workers as they deserve and reduce the wages of slackers, poor workmen and loafers, and finally reject the notorious principle of "making sure not to offend anyone."

Unfortunately, in life and in practice not everyone has come to an understanding of this simple truth. For example, this is what P. Fedoseyev from the village of Yuganets in Volodarskiy rayon, Gorkiy Oblast, writes:

"For many years this rule has been in force in the labor collectives: in the accountability reports minimize as much as possible the undisciplined people, the so-called 'difficult' ones, otherwise the brigade or shop will be last in competition. And this means that the collective will get no prize. And they ask me: what must be done? And this is how it is: if I work for 6 hours but for the other 2 am merely 'present at work' then I should receive money for 6 hours, not 8. Without discipline, without exactingness, perestroika is inconceivable."

V. Gavriluk, an engineer from Kiev, also counsels for discipline. He raises the question of whether leaders at any level should escape responsibility for gaps allowed in work, and whether they have the courage to "take the blows themselves" rather than dumping the blame on the "point man."

This thought can also be traced in the letters: for perestroika, economic leaders need new information. "From where can they get it?" asks V. Dereychuk from Chernigov.

"I think that it is high time for us to have our own academy to train these leaders." He advises that the most talented specialists be sent there. This is more promising than retraining the managers we already have. Future managers and general, commercial and technical directors must be sent on a mandatory basis to spend time with the best foreign firms.

Letters, letters, letters... Each day they arrive at the editorial offices in the thousands. No, they are not all about the conference. But almost all of them are permeated with its thoughts and ideas. This gives some indication of the impetus that it gave and of the confidence that it instilled in people's hearts.

The recent CPSU Central Committee plenum underscored with new force that for all party organizations, for all our cadres, for all collectives, and for every worker the time for action has arrived. It is time to move on to practical work decisively and without delay. Now as at no other time, unity of word and deed is essential, and a sense of responsibility for one's own action, and equally for one's inaction; this is what M.S. Gorbachev said at the plenum. The time has come for energetic action; we cannot delay. Only practical deeds to realize the political lines worked out by the conference will impart the necessary character to perestroyka.

09642

RSFSR Justice Minister Interviewed on Reform of Courts

18000548 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 13 Jul 88 p 2

[Interview by G. Orlovskiy: "The Honor of the Judge's Gown: Interview with RSFSR Minister of Justice, 19th All-Union Party Conference delegate V.A. Abolentsev"]

[Text] Increasing the court's role in the system of socialist democracy and the strict observance of the democratic principles of legal procedure were named among the important tasks of restructuring at the 19th All-Union Party Conference. There are many questions in the editorial mail: when and how will the reform be carried out? Furthermore, our readers feel that changes visible to the citizens should already be taking place in the court's everyday activity. This reader demand was the topic of our correspondent's interview with Vladimir Aleksandrovich Abolentsev, RSFSR Minister of Justice and delegate to the 19th All-Union Party Conference.

[Question] Can we expect, the readers ask, the forthcoming legal reform to grant the court some sort of special, qualitatively new status?

[Answer] Today these questions can be answered with confidence and enthusiasm. We have the resolution "On the Legal Reform," passed by the 19th All-Union Party Conference, in our hands. It is oriented toward restoring the Leninist vision of the court's role in our system of democracy and opens a broad scope for the functioning of all democratic principles of Soviet justice. In particular, guarantees of the implementation of principles such as controversial nature and glasnost in legal procedure will be significantly strengthened.

Is it necessary to grant the court special status? After all, in a legitimate socialist state, where law is supreme, the court can have no other status. Let us recall the popular saying: a judge is law which speaks, and the law is a mute judge. Expanding the powers and increasing the prestige of the court are an integral part of the democratization of the life of society.

Presently, the considerable expansion of the sphere of juridical competency—of the most democratic form of defense of rights and legal interests—is taking place. The Law on the Procedure for Appeal to the Court of Illegal Actions by Officials, Damaging the Rights of Citizens has been in effect since 1 January 1988. It has still not been put into broad practice, yet already the courts are receiving such statements by the citizens.

The Law on the Cooperative stipulates yet another new area of activity for the courts. Above all, it defends cooperatives from unsubstantiated interference in their work. The cooperatives have the right to appeal to the court or to arbitration the illegal acts of state and cooperative agencies, and to demand compensation for losses caused as a result of fulfilling instructions which

violate the rights of the cooperative. In particular, the examination of questions vitally important to the cooperatives, such as a refusal to register a cooperative's Charter or a decision to eliminate it, can now be carried out in an open juridical process. Disputes over the expulsion of members from a cooperative have also been placed under court jurisdiction.

Of course, additional legal guarantees are also needed for the judges themselves. One of them is the establishment of accountability for contempt of court.

[Question] It seems that the court's prestige depends not only on external factors but also on the judges themselves, on their professional training, cultural level and civic views, as well as on work conditions. Does the reform touch upon these questions?

[Answer] This matter was deemed urgent by the recently concluded party forum. It is a question of cadre support for the legal reform, which presupposes the creation of a structured system for the selection, upbringing, training and retraining of lawyers. I believe that it would be correct to say that this relates to judges in the first priority. The further we advance in restructuring and perfect our democratic system, the more urgently the question of justice cadres is raised. Why is the demand increasing? Precisely because in society the attention to the individual is increasing immeasurably, attention to his freedom, honor and dignity, and to ensuring his legal defense, for which hundreds of thousands of people are turning to the courts. Last year 1,840,000 civil cases alone were considered in the republic. It is easy to imagine how many people gained the opportunity to form their own opinion on legality and culture in juridical work, on the objectivity of the judges. Of course, the overwhelming majority of our judges are honest and principle-minded, modest people, who deservedly bear the high title of people's elected representative.

However, it must be confessed, there is still plenty of bureaucratism, low culture, and violations of procedural and even simply of professional and ethical norms in the courts. Abuses of power occur as well. Thus, judge Gudko of the Yegorlykskiy Rayon court, Rostov Oblast, enlisted people in the construction of his own house whose legal cases had been considered under his chairmanship. Naturally, he was recalled and expelled from the CPSU. Similar cases should be eliminated forever from court activity. We must take a decisive step toward considerably improving the selection of candidates in forming the judicial corps. Perhaps, among other conditions, the candidate should have previous experience with work in a juridical profession, including training in the court, and then take a special test of suitability for such work.

One of the trends in improving judges' work is the entry to a new level of professional training and increasing practical skills. To put it frankly, attention to this had become intolerably weak. Frequently, a VUZ graduate

straight out of school would be placed in control of the most complex mechanism of legal procedure. What could this have led to? In Altay Kray, where 60 of 150 judges were replaced in 3 years, over half of the errors were caused by novice workers. The young specialists turned out to have been essentially forgotten. The result was natural: the quality of examination of civil cases by the courts of Altay Kray dropped significantly in 1987.

Evidently, the reform documents also "formulate" questions of the material equipment of the courts. The readers of SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA would be convinced of the necessity of these measures, upon reading the article in the 19 May issue. Yes, although for decades we have tried to ignore it, the courts have been deprived. As far as the episodes cited in the raid, this series might continue. One does not even need to travel to remote krays to see this—it is enough to look at the condition of the premises, for instance, of the capital's Sokolnicheskiy People's Court. Overall, today 38 percent of the people's court buildings in the republic need replacement or reconstruction, and a significant share of them have become quite dilapidated. However, after all, all of this concerns not only the courts but also the notary offices and juridical consultations. In addition to premises, they now urgently need special types of furniture, transportation and office equipment, particularly equipment for the practical duplication of legal documents. The soviets of people's deputies could do a great deal here, and the RSFSR Ministry of Justice and the leaders of its local agencies must also make a genuine effort in this area.

[Question] Many people view freeing the judges of "outside influence" as a radical treatment for juridical diseases. What steps in this direction could turn out to be the most fruitful?

[Answer] The higher the level of democracy and glasnost in our society, and the more visible the fruits of restructuring in political life, then all the more odious the custom of some people of informing judges of a "guiding opinion" looks against this background. Here a great deal depends on expanding the legal guarantees of the judges' independence. These are named in the party conference resolution (incidentally, the resolution emphasizes ensuring absolute independence). One of these guarantees should be the election of rayon, city, okrug, oblast and kray courts by the higher soviets of people's deputies, as well as establishing a longer term of office. Specific measures of accountability for interfering in the activity of judges will also be determined.

[Question] Will the steps undertaken help to eliminate the accusatory bias and make the presumption of innocence the personal conviction of each judge?

[Answer] Justice is above all a social institution, and it would be unjust to deduce its flaws from internal development alone. The last 3 years have convincingly shown that expansion of glasnost and discussion of the problems of justice affect it in a most favorable manner.

However, of course, the inertia of stagnation is still very strong and it would be naive to assume that it can be eliminated by orders from above. The fear of "not guilty" verdicts still exists. For instance, we recently saw how the Komi ASSR Supreme Court deals with the pronouncement of such sentences. It turns out that of 32 "not guilty" verdicts issued by the people's courts in 1986-1987, this court repealed 18 with an order for additional investigation, in the course of which the cases were dismissed. Why was this done? The judges were afraid to take responsibility.

The ministry recently examined the problem of the groundless conviction of five young people in Novosibirsk, who had been accused of causing serious bodily harm, leading to the death of the victim, and the perpetration of malicious hooliganism. They were sentenced to long periods of imprisonment: four of them had been kept under guard for 5 years, another—for more than 4. The case was recently dismissed. It was shown that the guilt of the convicted had not been proven. What is the basis of similar errors? Above all, it is the violation of legal requirements for the thorough and full investigation of the circumstances of a case, including the careless treatment of the defendants' statement regarding facts which would have testified in favor of their innocence.

The party conference emphasized the need to strictly observe the presumption of innocence and the inadmissibility of both an accusatory bias, as well as tolerance with regard to those who have infringed on Soviet law.

The legal reform also enables us to expand the existing guarantees of the right of the accused to defense. Underestimating the role of the lawyer is the cause of more than one juridical error. A study of the practice of Kursk Oblast courts, where Ministry of Justice workers recently visited, has shown that of 200 cases, which were dismissed in the appellate and investigative procedures, in 176 the lawyers had drawn the court's attention to the defendants' lack of guilt. However, these arguments were not analyzed from objective stances and were groundlessly rejected. For instance, in the case of the veterinarian Kasyanov, accused of negligence, the lawyer Stepanova presented the rayon court with proofs testifying to the defendant's innocence, to which the court paid no attention. However, the oblast court dismissed the case due to lack of criminal evidence, based on this lawyer's very same arguments.

The party conference resolution supported numerous proposals for raising the role of the legal profession as a self-directing association. As a result of the reform, legal aid to citizens, state enterprises and cooperatives, and the representation of their interests in court and in other state agencies and public organizations will increase. The conference also agreed with suggestions to expand the participation of defendants in the preliminary investigation and legal proceedings.

However, let us go back to judges. Their firm orientation toward impartiality depends not only on changing the attitude toward defense, but also on increasing the role of the people's jurymen, who are equal to judges in terms of rights. Here, we must maximally utilize democratization as an instrument of restructuring in eradicating formalism: beginning with the selection of people's jurymen and their training and ending with the pronouncement of juridical decisions. The party conference deemed it expedient to increase the number of people's jurymen during the consideration of the most complex matters in court. This was done to raise the objectivity of justice. This measure, frankly speaking, is new and unaccustomed for us. I believe that it will require an increase in the self-exigency of all judges, as well as in that of prosecutors, investigators and lawyers.

As we see, the reform affects all aspects of the legal system. It should fully conform to the new level of socialist democracy.

13362

Head of Political Science Research Center Writes on 'Legal State'

18000550a Moscow *SOVETSKAYA KULTURA*
in Russian 14 Jul 88 p 3

[Article by Doctor of Juridical Sciences Professor Mikhail Piskotin: "Above Everything"]

[Text] Doctor of Juridical Sciences Professor Mikhail Ivanovich Piskotin was for a long time in charge of the journal *GOSUDARSTVO I PRAVO*. Now he is the leader of the recently created Center for Political Studies at the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of State and Law and of the Soviet Association of Political Science. M. Piskotin, a regular contributor to *SOVETSKAYA KULTURA*, is working on the problem of the theory of state and financial law and state management. His latest book is entitled "Sotsializm i gosudarstvennoye upravleniye" [Socialism and State Management]. He took part in a *SOVETSKAYA KULTURA* round-table that discussed the CPSU Central Committee Theses on the eve of the party conference under the title "Through Discussion to Action."

The "Legal State," Not the Right to Arbitrary Rule

The 19th All-Union Party Conference which has just ended put forward the task of making our state a truly legal state.

This idea—the idea of the legal state—has been nurtured by public thinking for some centuries. It is a truly very important achievement of political and legal culture. Wherein lies its essence? First and foremost in the limitation of state law and in the true supremacy of the law. The legal state assumes the existence of the kind of system of democratic and legal institutions in which the law is adopted only by the elected representatives of the

people on the basis of free and comprehensive debate, and in which the power of the state and the activity of its organs are limited by the strict framework of the law, and the rights and interests of citizens reliably protected.

But why is it that the idea, undoubtedly a progressive one, of creating the legal state in our country is only now being proposed? Could it have come into being earlier?

The source of the Soviet state is the slogan of the dictatorship of the working class. The establishment of society was accompanied not only by the dismantling of the old machinery of state but also the destruction of the previous legal system. In the words of V.I. Lenin, the new power was confirmed as "... the power gained and supported through the coercion of the bourgeoisie by the proletariat, and power has nothing at all to do with laws."

However, even during the initial period of its existence, when the foundations of new legislation were being laid, Soviet power advanced the task of guaranteeing revolutionary legality. And with the end of the civil war and the transition to NEP this task acquired special keenness.

The transition to NEP objectively required enhancement of the role of the law. For the sphere of operation for money-exchange relationships was expanding and required a firm legal basis. Moreover, it was necessary to bring within legal frameworks the work of the new state apparatus, for which, in the words of M.I. Kalinin, management at that time meant "to handle things in a totally independent way without being subordinated to the regulatory articles of law." This had become customary during the civil war but this kind of "habit" became dangerous in peacetime. Halting the excesses and arbitrary rule of the representatives of power and guaranteeing the safety of the individual became a most important condition for insuring the trust of the peasantry and all workers in Soviet power.

But NEP was short-lived. It is not surprising that in that period some jurists made attempts to regard the Soviet state as a legal state and carry on their activities under the conditions existing in a legal regime. Of course, in the mid-Twenties this kind of conclusion could be perceived rather as an orientation on the future—a course toward enhancing the role of the law. But the administrative-command system, on whose basis the bureaucratic forces were consolidated and the cult of Stalin grew, saw in legality only a means of rigid centralization and discipline. That system needed unrestricted power. The system itself wanted to establish for itself "convenient laws," essentially asserting a "right" to arbitrary rule. The idea of the "legal state" in no way met those goals, even as a prospect for the future. Late in 1929 L.M. Kaganovich turned on it with sharp criticism. Having stated that this idea is non-Marxist, he pointed out its incompatibility with the dictatorship of the working class. The idea was put aside for many years. It was not

even remembered in the early Sixties when it was concluded that the Soviet state should grow, and from an organ of dictatorship of the working class become an organ of all the people.

We returned again to this idea only following adoption of the 1977 USSR Constitution. In the "Political-Legal Commentaries" on it it was pointed out that the Soviet state not only promulgates laws "but also is itself 'linked' to the law and builds its activity on the basis of law and undeviatingly complies with it. This is grounds for believing that our Soviet national state is truly a legal state."

Unfortunately, at the time that was mere declaration. Let us not be in error: even now we are still very far from being able to call our state fully legal. Yes, it may become legal but only on the basis of reform in the political system. As M.S. Gorbachev said at the 19th All-Union Party Conference, "... for decades the existing political system has been adapted not to the organization of public life within the framework of the law but mainly to fulfillment of arbitrary directions and instructions." Even today the bureaucratic forces that have grown out of this are trying to preserve for themselves the right to decide everything, answering to no one and protecting themselves against any kind of criticism.

The 19th Party Conference defined the main directions for reform of the political system and thus pointed out the way to complete the process of creating a socialist legal state. The conference resolution states that "delineating the functions of party and state organs and restoration of the full power of the soviets, from top to bottom, is of key importance." Provision is also made for a reform of the court system and other institutions that guarantee the legal regulation of delineations between state and citizens. Now everything depends on what kind of specific decisions flow from the course proclaimed by the conference and to what extent the political activeness of all healthy forces in society grows.

It is essential to distinguish the key issues for which it is particularly important to find new and consistently democratic solutions. These include, in particular, introduction of an electoral system that guarantees free nomination and self-nomination of candidates, and the kind of representation in the soviets that reflects real plurality of opinion and the true dependence of candidates on their voters. They include expansion of the powers exclusive to the soviets and their transformation into true legislative organs that on the basis of the general political course of the party shape policy in specific fields of public life. Organs capable of handling financial matters, confirming specific plans and programs, monitoring the activity of management organs and so forth. They include the establishment of legal guarantees for glasnost, and much, much else.

What kinds of mechanisms can triumph over the "right of arbitrary rule"? It stands to reason that these are the consolidation of the legal foundation of state and public life and stricter delineation between the functions of party and state organs. And of course, fulfillment by the soviets of their constitutional role. And finally, instituting reliable control to insure that the legislative acts adopted conform with the USSR Constitution, establishing reliable legal guarantees for citizens' rights, and so forth.

Transformation of the Soviet state into a truly legal state is linked inseparably not only with enhancing the actual role of the law but also with changing the methods of legal regulation of social relations.

Interdiction and Legal Nihilism

It is a commonplace that the bureaucratization of public life resulting from the many years of the administrative-command system in party and state leadership of the country has affected the role of the law in a paradoxical way. At one and the same time it has also resulted in a spirit of interdiction, extraordinary regulation of public life, and nihilism with respect to the law.

Even recently, literally everywhere we encountered the notorious "rigid frameworks" and restrictions and prohibitions. This total interdiction was underpinned by an ideological base: everywhere we fancied that we saw the signs of capitalism and its rebirth, when in reality there was no trace of this danger. These signs were very convenient for the bureaucracy. They were exaggerated. They really were suggestive against the backdrop of oversimplified, primitive ideas about socialism. In this situation even the development of the cooperatives and individual labor activity were perceived as a retreat from the socialist path of development. Even private subsidiary farming was under suspicion. And entrepreneurship and competition were regarded totally as phenomena profoundly alien to socialism.

Bureaucratic forces wanted to control everyone and everything. And under the wing of "everything that is not permitted is prohibited" legal nihilism flourished luxuriantly. It even appeared in the underestimation of the potential of the law and in gross violation of the law.

The innumerable prohibitions closed ranks with legal nihilism in that they left the citizen or enterprise very little independence, real rights, or freedom to act as he or it saw fit. Moreover, the resolution of a multitude of questions had to be passed to the "authorities" for judgment. They could amend an enterprise plan, allocate additional funds or refuse them, permit or ban a book or film—this was the situation, far removed from general declarations. Under these conditions citizens and enterprises and kolkhozes were often forced to evade the law and seek out loopholes in the numerous instructions. Alas! the figure of the "selfless criminal" is our own

homemade product. But of course, against this backdrop, the mercenary criminals prospered. Interdiction nourished corruption and bribe-taking. How was it possible to talk about strengthening legality?

It is common knowledge that the more prohibitions there are the more difficult it becomes to insure observance of them. For people could see the absurdity of many restrictions, which often went against common sense. As a result, violations became an everyday thing. But as many prohibitions as there were, the law enforcement organs and the "authorities" had a mass of means to deal with the obstinate and the objectionable, relying on the force of instructions or some law. They could use them for various purposes—to eliminate a rival, force the silence of a witness, take revenge on a neighbor... No, increasing the prohibitions did not strengthen law and order but served only to spread lawlessness and dissoluteness.

Legal nihilism has clear historical roots. Even though soon after the October Revolution V.I. Lenin and the party proclaimed the task of guaranteeing legality, rightist nihilism was extremely widespread in the Twenties and early Thirties. Whereas at first it fed on the leftist ideas of the withering away of law, as the administrative-command system grew in strength it began to acquire a demagogic tone. The law was regarded only as an instrument of policy. Its class-coercive aspect was overemphasized in every possible way. "The law is a form of the expression and use of violence"; that is what was cynically stated by P.F. Yudin, who was made an "academician" by Stalin in 1936.

In its theory, legal nihilism loyally served unlawful practice. Whereas in open political processes some attempt was still made to observe some semblance of relying on the law, in the mass repressions no particular effort was made to follow procedural forms or cite criminal law. What was the need?: the "administration of justice" was accomplished with the stroke of a pen and in total secrecy.

Legal nihilism had a destructive effect, particularly in the years of stagnation, on the economy. Neglect of cost accounting and its transformation into a "theoretical convention" also imparted an inflection of convention to all legal regulation of economic relations. This created fertile ground for bad management. The law on the enterprise was quite often violated. And this led to leveling, loss of the sense of being master of things, and apathy. Enterprises simply learned to go to arbitration: it was not their affair anyway, cost accounting was a convention, and relations might be spoiled...

And today radical perestroika in economic management is associated with restoring the true role of the law. However, instead of extending regulation, another path has been chosen—sharply limiting it. All the instructions that contradict the Law on the State Enterprise and fetter

independence and initiative are being rescinded. Everything that is not prohibited is permitted: this is now the principle being implemented. It is also becoming a general principle of Soviet law. An important point of departure from which the spirit of prohibition has now started to be supplanted.

What Is Dangerous about the "Management of People"

The command system has created many paradoxes. In particular, by leveling the individual, including the leader, and making him a slave to instructions it has given enormous power to the official. Posts with arm-chairs. It is not only the "first people" who have acquired enormous real power but also each person who is in charge of something or makes assignments. And the rules are often not the law but the people occupying the posts. And they are often subordinate not to the law at all but rather to certain unwritten rules drawn up by the apparatus. The rules are ultimately subordinate to a narrow circle of persons who "made the weather."

Of course, no kind of management can be simply compliance with the law. It requires initiative and the creative approach to a matter. It requires the right of managers to resolve particular questions independently. This is why management needs talented, bright individuals. But their independence and "right of discretion" should be provided for in the law itself rather than being achieved by evading it. A law should be reasonable and meet present-day conditions and needs. But it must be observed absolutely. Particularly today, under cost-accounting conditions, it should become a guarantee for the rights of each enterprise.

However, in order to consolidate the "management of the law" with few declarations real changes are needed in the management system. When the diktat of the producer has been overcome and a full-fledged socialist market starts to operate, the law will become a much more necessary instrument than it is now for regulating relations in the economic sphere.

For the "management of people" comes about wherever we find a very great dependence of the managed on the managers. Here, not only enterprises but also citizens experience this dependence, being placed very often in the position of supplicants. One must beg for an apartment, a trip to a sanatorium, a place for the children in a creche. Before buying a car one must ask to be placed on the list... The normal feelings of human dignity are served better by the opportunity to buy what is necessary using money honestly earned. While officials enjoy the opportunity of resolving a question "at their discretion" the law will play a very modest role. It is not fortuitous that in the event of conflicts, people usually go not to the courts, not to the procuracy, but to the party organs, the newspapers, the television. And what we have here is not an inadequate legal standard or inadequate legal knowledge. The cause lies in the system of relations, in the procedure for the distribution of state resources and

blessings and public consumption funds. In this sphere the legal standard of citizens can be raised only by raising legal standards in the regulation of such relations and by overcoming the urge "to nationalize everyone and everything."

"But We Scowl Fiercely"

After the October Revolution, as is known two approaches could be seen among the Bolsheviks toward the cultural legacy of the past. One suggested the use of all previous history. According to the other, everything old was trash and should be discarded, and a new house of culture built from new. V.I. Lenin advocated the former position, including in the attitude toward the law as a cultural phenomenon. It was not happenstance that the best jurists, who had received their education in prerevolutionary universities, were recruited to work on the first Soviet codes of law and other very important legislative acts. However, the influence of leftist forces was felt on the subsequent development of Soviet legislation, and many of the achievements of political and legal culture from preceding centuries were simply discarded as useless. The wisdom accumulated over the centuries, and humanistic values all became victims of command-administrative methods in management and the course toward every conceivable kind of cruel punitive practice.

The mass repressions of the Thirties and Forties were not only political in nature, not only fabricated political charges that deprived people of the freedom and life. Remember that the law of 7 August 1932, and later the ukases of 1947 were aimed at protecting socialist property. People were imprisoned even for collecting ears of grain. There is, for example, the case in which kolkhoz farmers who had purchased sacks of oats from some serviceman passing through the village were shot. And before the war they started to convict people who were late for work.

At that time it was useless for legal experts to talk about the wisdom and fairness of the law. Or about what in the mid-18th century Montesquieu had written in his book "The Spirit of Laws," showing the harmfulness of severe punishment and the need to abolish torture as unnecessarily cruel and in no way helping to reveal the truth. The representatives of the administrative-command system recognized only one "wisdom"—that a law should serve primarily it, and, of course, them. And jurisprudence? It should not tie one's hands. Entire generations of people were reared in this practice.

Of course, even then the concept of good was shaped not only under the influence of the official propaganda. The outstanding creations of culture and the spiritual wisdom of the people influenced the concept of justice. But the power of official propaganda extraordinarily great. And proclaiming mercilessness and sternness against those who were declared to be enemies, it surreptitiously

shaped callousness. Society gradually became accustomed to people being swallowed up in the abyss of repressions and was supposed to know nothing. People became accustomed to pretending that the camps were not devouring hundreds of thousands of victims all the time.

At the time of the great French Revolution, one of its tribunes, Mirabeau, said that "indifference to injustice is betrayal and baseness." It cannot be said that indifference and apathy assailed all Soviet people. But the repressions were turned precisely on those who tried to prevent them or cast doubt on their justice, and the number of "concerned" people shrank steadily. And this is one of the most grim and demoralizing consequences of the personality cult. And when today the press remembers its victims it is doing only the minimum that society must do to deal with the dangerous disease of apathy and indifference.

For it is the age-old dilemma: is it worse to condemn ten innocent people rather than leave one person guilty of a crime free? Or should ten guilty ones stay free so as to prevent condemnation of even one innocent person? A difficult choice, it would seem. But progressive, humane thinking long ago made its choice. The basis of the conclusion is the recognition of the highest value of the human individual and his life and freedom. To the extent that this value is disregarded the fight against crime is not improved. On the contrary, punishing an innocent person provides the criminal with an opportunity to remain at large.

This is why any manifestations of the accusatory approach in the activity of law enforcement organs is at variance with the spirit of our society. But they are still preserved, and they rely on certain provisions in the law. For example, for most criminal cases, the preliminary investigation here is conducted without the participation of a lawyer even though all world practice has shown the lack of humanity and irrationality of this procedure.

The Law Should Be the Law

During the period of the revolutionary transformations in the first years of Soviet power, its decrees were often propagandist in nature. The new foundations of social life and new principles of law were formulated in them. Under the conditions of perestroika legislation sometimes turns anew to that experience. For example, the Law on the State Enterprise (or Association) describes in detail the new system of socialist management and sounds more like a political declaration than an enforceable enactment. We also find traces of declamation in the Law on Cooperatives in the USSR. In the new laws, political and economic issues have been dealt with to the detriment of what are properly legal issues. Meanwhile, any law is designed to be first and foremost a legal document and contain very clear and non-contradictory rules that leave no place for different interpretations or reduce the opportunity for such interpretations to a

minimum. Take just two provisions of the Law on the State Enterprise, those on state orders and on superior organs above the enterprise; and we see that they do not meet this requirement.

The category of state order is defined so imprecisely that a loophole has appeared to use it against the general purpose of the law. It was the legislator's intention that an order should replace a plan task. In reality it has become merely a new symbol for mandatory plan tasks of the state for enterprises, a tool for improving initiative and independence.

The law can be the law if there is an effective mechanism for protecting it and when a requirement of a law can be defended first and foremost in the courts. When legislative acts are being drawn up, these requirements are still being disregarded. This, unworkable acts are promulgated, leading only to a lowering of the authority of the law. But even an irreproachable law loses its force if compliance with it cannot be guaranteed. Nothing undermines legality like connivance at violating it. Irresponsibility in the years of stagnation became the same sort of ill as mismanagement. In order to overcome it there must be full realization of the Leninist requirement for the inevitability of responsibility. Cases in which persons who have permitted obvious violations of the law and even themselves committee crimes are given a dressing down through public censure or party reprimand but are not held legally liable, are quite intolerable.

Everyday life convinces us that raising legal standards is not simply a matter of enlightenment. In order to change attitudes toward the law and its role in the country's life what is needed is a system of measures, a further upsurge in society's culture of humanity, and the restructuring of our legal institutions using all the best things accumulated in world legal practice. Then it will not be possible for the law to be violated by personal authority.

09642

Jurist Examines Proposal to Combine Party, Soviet Posts

PM2207123 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Jul 88 Morning Edition p 3

[Article by Doctor of Juridical Sciences B. Kurashvili, leading staffer at the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of State and Law, under the rubric "19th Party Conference: Reflections on the Decisions": "Secretary and Chairman in One Person. Paradox of Combining Posts To Separate Functions"—boldface as published]

[Text] One of the unexpected ideas advanced in M.S. Gorbachev's report at the 19th all-union party conference was that of combining the posts of party committee first secretary from rayon level on up, right up to the Central Committee, and head of the corresponding Soviet of People's Deputies. Some people supported it, while others had doubts. Scientists too differed in their

assessments. Many people see here not democratization but a strengthening of authoritarianism. In reality the situation is more complex. In order to assess the real significance of this proposal, we must examine it in the context of all the planned changes.

Three Organizational Factors

The reinstatement of the sovereignty of soviets at various levels is becoming a key element of the reconstruction of the whole system of power. The second key element of the reform—the ending of **direct party management** of economic and sociocultural activity and the "departure" of the party and its organs back to their own sphere of ideological and political work and the elaboration of strategic problems and political control over their resolution—is inseparably linked with the soviets' real sovereignty.

We had a long period of declarations and invocations with regard to "increasing the party's leading role." However, they were accompanied by a virtual drop in its prestige, by social processes' getting out of control, and by stagnation. Now, at last, cooperation is being created between the party and the soviets, thanks to which there will really be an increase both in the role of the party—in the form of strengthening its **political influence** on social relations—and in the role of the soviets—in the form of enhancing the efficiency of **state management** of social activity as a **self-governing** process.

Soviet society, which is being renewed in the font of restructuring, will acquire—this, at any rate, is its ardent hope—an efficient, harmonious political system within whose framework three organizational factors are differentiated and integrated—party political influence, authoritative-democratic state management, and social self-management in all its forms (production, local, self-management of public organizations). Only such a system will be capable of leading socialism into a new round of development. This is the more or less clearly realized profound essence of the changes proclaimed by the conference.

The regime of state power, the political regime takes shape in each historical epoch, in each period of the socialist state's development as a combination of two polar characteristics adapted to specific conditions—positively understood authoritarianism (one-sided imperiousness, subordination, discipline) and democratism (equality, freedom, self-management). We are now accomplishing a far-reaching shift from the first pole to the second. Only this does not mean abolishing authoritarianism (such a thing is quite impossible and is a path to anarchy and the disorganization of social life) but transforming it. The combining of posts and the emergence of the figure of the "secretary-chairman" (let us for the time being give this provisional name to the future post of soviet chairman) cannot be properly understood unless we take into account such fundamental changes to the system of power as: a) strengthening the soviets'

popular nature and ending the practice of electing to them leaders of the management apparatus ("soviets without dignitaries" but, of course, with Communists); b) switching soviets to permanent functioning, with the deputies' full or partial release from their production work ("the soviets are real working corporations"); c) creating soviet presidiums at both rayon and oblast level and, thus, freeing them from the tutelage of executive organs; d) abruptly strengthening the soviets' monitoring functions with the transfer of people's control committees to their direct management; e) broadening the rights of republic and local soviets and the ultimate establishment of their "normal power."

In conjunction with these changes the innovation under consideration certainly does not appear as it would if it were introduced into the system of power which exists now.

The Benefit and Inevitability of Combined Office

We have before us a typical paradoxical solution. Reason opposes and cannot at once understand and grasp what is planned. It is indeed necessary to delimit the functions of the party and the soviets, but what is proposed is an official union, a combining of the leadership of the party and the soviets in the same hands. Absurd? When I took to KOMMUNIST my article containing a similar proposal (it was published in No 8 for 1988), the journal's editors—really qualified people—did not at once understand and demanded an explanation. In involved situations it is precisely paradoxical solutions that frequently prove to be the only way out. This is being realized only gradually. This innovation was adopted equivocally at the conference, where much attention was devoted to this question. Many people still cast doubt on it. Therefore an investigation, an analysis, is needed.

The point of combining the said posts is to ensure in the organizational respect both the strengthening of the soviets' role and an end to **direct party management** of social life and to party organs' doubling for the state and economic apparatus. And this is not done at the price of diminishing the role of party leadership.

The procedure for electing the first party leader or the leader of the ruling party or its organization to the post of soviet chairman will provide a clear idea of the party's real influence among the people and of the real prestige of particular party leaders. It is very useful to have this idea, for our party serves the people, works for the people, and must verify both its own prestige and that of its cadres precisely by the people's assessment.

It will evidently be necessary to establish the rule that, on nominating a single candidate for the post of soviet chairman, he is considered elected if at least two-thirds or even three-fourths of those who participated in the election voted for him. The following approach is not ruled out either: Two or three party committee members

are nominated as candidates for this post, but the one who receives the majority of the votes becomes both soviet chairman and party committee first secretary.

The party leader will, as it were, be taken out of the apparatus environment and placed in another one—the people's environment, the deputy's environment. For a political leader this is pure mountain air that refreshes the consciousness.

In resolving specific questions of management the substantial "secretary-chairman" will not tackle them along party lines because there are more opportunities along soviet lines—the legitimate authoritative powers above all. Accordingly, the corpulent party apparatus will become slim and trim while the emaciated soviet apparatus will put on weight, and both will arrive at the norm. The "secretary-chairman" will not have the self-seeking interest of certain present secretaries in upholding and demonstrating "the party's leading role" in its present form, and he will be led not by ambitions close to departmental ones but by the interests of the matter. The combining of posts will make it possible to realize the principle "everyone does his own thing" most directly at apparatus level.

A fundamentally new, more democratic and, at the same time, reliable form of exercising state power is being created. The fact that the soviets will be headed by "first persons" in the political system will bring the soviets' formal and real powers into line. These collective organs will not be obedient tools in the hands of the "first persons" if the role of the soviets and their deputies is really raised and if the people elect really competent and scrupulous persons as their representatives on the soviet. Persons you cannot order about—and if you do try to order them about you will get your fingers burned.

I believe it will be possible to introduce a mechanism of a "delaying veto" imposed by the soviet head on its decisions. This mechanism will evidently be needed, taking into account the upcoming real process of democratization. No collective organ is insured against enthusiasms, extremes, and mistakes. This mechanism will overcome them on a democratic basis.

Party committee first secretaries, who play a key role in the political system at every level of management, are not deprived of this role when **direct party management** ceases. They gain an opportunity, given the population's trust in them (and in no way can it be otherwise!), to occupy a key place in the state system. Thus, official union is the only real means of transferring power from a party to a state basis. And those who speak of restructuring as a "social revolution" with its basic question—that of power—are not quite divorced from reality.

Not To Cross the Line

The chief thing is that the modifying of power should be irreproachably democratic. And this is how it is planned. All is good, but we must think very strongly about the

process of this modification and about all its complexities. It is a question, let us say, of the figure of the soviet chairman. Not the leader of the soviet presidium but of the soviet as a whole. Leadership of the presidium's work is just an additional duty of his. So the soviet gets two leaders, as it were—the one-man chairman and the collective presidium.

Will it not happen here that the soviet presidium as a plenipotentiary collective organ will take a back seat? The functions and, thus, the powers of the soviet chairman—at any rate in the context of resolutions already adopted and the views expressed—appear wider and more considerable than the presidium's functions. The latter, according to the report, is entrusted just with convening sessions and coordinating the standing commissions' activity. And the same at union level. But the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet must "exercise overall leadership of the preparation of laws and major socioeconomic programs, decide (precisely decide, not prepare decisions or organize their elaboration—B.K.) key questions of foreign policy, of the country's defense capability and security...." We must be very attentive here in order not to encroach upon the soviets' collectivist essence. For no subsystem of power in our country, except for the administrative one, knows of such wide powers for a one-man leader as are planned for the soviet chairman. We cannot allow a situation, even theoretically, in which relations typical of a ministry, where the minister decides things off his own bat while the collegium has mere consultative rights, could take shape in the soviets.

Elementary democratic feeling protests against any organizational enactment which permits even a hint of the idea that soviets and deputies can be subordinate to any one person and that someone can order them about. Soviet deputies obey only socialist law (as the normative expression of social justice) and the rightful law. They are guided by their civic conscience, by the voters' interests and mandates, and in no way by instructions from the leadership [nachalstvo], whatever it calls itself. The introduction of the post of soviet chairman with wide powers must be very precisely correlated with the very nature of the soviets.

Only such an approach can make the institution of combined office democratic and acceptable. Otherwise it could be an expression not of the democratization of the system of power but of the opposite process, and will be a means of strengthening authoritarianism and infringing the democratism of power and the straightest path toward its new bureaucratization. The party, the public, and the USSR Supreme Soviet, which will make amendments to the USSR Constitution, still have time to ponder and analyze these and other similar questions. I hope to discuss some of them in my next article in IZVESTIYA.

Jurist Discusses Conference Decision on Legal Reform

PM0108130 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Jul 88 Morning Edition p 3

[Article by B. Kurashvili, doctor of juridical sciences and leading scientific staffer at the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of State and Law, under the "19th Party Conference: Reflections on the Decisions" rubric: "What Should the Power Structure Be?"—first two paragraphs and last three are editorial comment; boldface as published]

[Text] A recent issue of IZVESTIYA (No 204) published an article by Doctor of Juridical Sciences B. Kurashvili entitled "Secretary and Chairman in One Person," in which the author reflected on the 19th party conference decisions on the separation of the functions of party and soviet organs.

Today he continues his discussion on the conference decisions.

In discussing the ideas of the 19th all-union conference on reconstructing [rekonstruktsiya] supreme power, I should say that we are faced with a general concept of changes rather than an actual plan. The plan still has to be drafted and its nationwide discussion organized, as it involves making major alterations to the USSR Constitution. What is under way now is **preplan discussion**. The significance of the conference, its innovative and democratic character, is shown, among other things, by the fact that it invited the public and the scientific community to think about the very essence of the outlined transformations well in advance.

As far as juridical science is concerned, I am aware, working as I do in a leading research institute, of the ambiguous evaluation of these transformations. The essence of the concept, namely the need to separate party political influence and state power and switch management from a party to a soviet footing is unanimously supported, although different ways of implementing the legal aspects of it are proposed. I already wrote about the debate on such a key feature as "combining posts" in my earlier article. Today I would like to offer IZVESTIYA readers my own clearly far from incontrovertible opinions on a number of projected elements of the organization of supreme power.

The new link in the system of representative organs—the USSR Congress of People's Deputies—is a very important element in the political reform. It comprises somewhat over 2,000 deputies who are elected for 5 years and sit twice a year. Two-thirds of the deputies are sent to the congress by the population of the country, and one-third by the party, Komsomol, trade unions, and other public organizations on the basis of adopted lists and quotas. It is proposed that the congress will elect a permanent organ of power—the USSR Supreme Soviet—from its members. It is also planned that the chairman of the

USSR Supreme Soviet will be elected by it. As the party conference said, the congress resolves the "most important constitutional, political, and socioeconomic questions in the life of the country." And the Supreme Soviet? It adopts laws and decisions on the "key problems of state life."

What is unusual here? A kind of dual supreme representation comprising "mass" and "working" elements. The "mass" element is the USSR Congress of People's Deputies, and the "working" element is the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The congress has yet another elective function—the formation of a Constitutional Oversight Committee. The election of the Constitutional Oversight Committee by the congress makes it independent of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and that makes good sense, since it is necessary to carry out monitoring to ensure that the laws and other decisions adopted by the [Supreme] Soviet are in line with the USSR Constitution.

But it is proposed that the congress of soviets be vested not only with elective functions. Legislative functions are also envisaged. Thought has to be given as to how this is to be done, given the existence of the Supreme Soviet. In my view, the Supreme Soviet can do all the same things here. The following question therefore arises: Will we not encounter a duplication of legislative functions and will this not reduce the authority and legal force of acts passed by the Supreme Soviet? Or is the congress conceived as a kind of substitute for the referendums which are provided for by the constitution but which have never yet been carried out? No, it cannot serve as such a substitute. There will have to be referendums.

Let us now look at public organizations' representation within the congress. This representation makes democratic sense. We see an attempt to convene something like a "general assembly" once a year. However, we must also ponder and think this all through carefully so that democratic trends are strengthened rather than weakened, since the state is not a narrowly national, production, professional, or group organization but a socioterritorial one. Friedrich Engels' thoughts on this score are well known. The state embraces the territory of the country and is divided into territorial units which send their representatives to the chief elected organ, which carries out the supreme management of the country. We experienced an attempt to depart from the socioterritorial basis when Nikita Khrushchev surprised the world by coming up with the idea of dividing every oblast into two parts—industrial and agricultural. And what was the upshot? Great disorganization.

I am not intending to draw parallels in any way here. On the contrary, the inclusion of the envoys of public organizations in the supreme elected organ along with representatives of territorial and national-territorial communities is a very democratic measure. It promises

to ensure that society will be represented in all its diversity. However, a number of questions do arise. For example, that of the equality of citizens at elections. It appears that people who do not belong to public organizations will have the opportunity to send one representative, whereas members of public organizations can send several representatives, does it not? And how are the quotas for organizations to be determined? If in terms of their membership, does this not mean that the representation of trade unions will be six times greater than that of the party? And if such proportionality is not adhered to, if everything will depend on the organizations' political weight, how is this weight to be measured and translated into an agreed number of deputies? And what does one do with newly arising organizations? Will only congress deputies elected from territorial units be included in the Supreme Soviet or will envoys of public organizations also be? And so forth.

All these questions must be studied and discussed right now, since it is clear that obtaining a correct answer to them, one that is compatible with expanding and strengthening people's power, is no easy matter.

Since conference decisions are to a certain extent generalizing in nature and the creative spirit of the conference itself showed that a particular truth is only found as a result of collective discussion, I would like to put forward some further suggestions of my own. Take the delegation of deputies of public organizations. If public organizations exist for society and not just to satisfy the specific interests of their members (such organizations exist), their socially active members can be evaluated by society and sent to elected organs by territorial units.

This constitutes the direct entry to the soviets. So will we not be violating social justice by opening up other, additional entries to the organs of people's power?

It is also clearly necessary to give thought to ensuring that the congress does not by the very fact of its existence reduce the Supreme Soviet's authority, that one does not appear to be a "superparliament" while the other bears a "secondary" hue.

The idea of a USSR Congress of People's Deputies contains a highly attractive feature. It is essentially the idea of an assembly which is as broad as possible, something akin to a statewide aktiv, a large collective think tank for the country. But it is impossible to imagine this idea taking the form of a kind of general state conference of the USSR which could include Supreme Soviet deputies, members of the Council of Ministers, other leaders of the USSR, members of soviet presidiums, leaders at republic and oblast level, and representatives of public organizations convened when special need arises (almost yearly) by the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium at its own discretion or at the demand of some deputies of that soviet or of the union republics. The assembly can make political decisions which will be

subsequently implemented in the laws and resolutions of organs of state power and management through elections and referendums. May it not be sensible to think in this direction too?

The Congress of People's Deputies, as already said, will also have to elect a USSR Supreme Soviet chairman. This is a very important function. It is one of the most crucial functions vested in the country's supreme organ of power. After all, it is a matter of electing the head of state.

A rough listing of the duties of the chairman of the Supreme Soviet already shows that great power will be concentrated in his hands. There is consensus that such concentration of power for a certain period is justified by the situation, especially today. Moreover, the tense and unstable circumstances of restructuring, the correlation of forces fighting for it and sabotaging it, and the situation in the management apparatus are such that the strengthening of the power of the head of state is essential if the process of democratization is to be assured. The conference decisions here are bold and correct, in my view. But they also demand additional profound study regarding certain specific elements of the power structure.

Our great and tragic history insistently reminds us that such a post can, in a one-party system—even involuntarily—make for an excessive concentration of power in one pair of hands that is not easily susceptible of control. We must therefore think about how to create the maximum safeguards against this producing conditions for new absolute rule.

Such guarantees are particularly important when soviet chairmen exercise power at local level, where both public opinion and the strength of democratic institutions in our country are substantially weaker than at the center. It is necessary therefore to take care to find forms for the exercise of power suitable both for today's goals and the long-term future. **Reliable guarantees must be incorporated in the actual system of power**, not in people, who naturally change and are replaced.

So what is necessary here? Various opinions are expressed on this score among legal scholars, sociologists, and political experts. Two opinions are most widespread, in my opinion. One of them, which was discussed in general terms at the conference, says that it is necessary to strengthen the existing collegial head of state—the Presidium. And it is possible to achieve this by virtue of the fact that the CPSU Central Committee general secretary will be elected to the post of chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium by the population of the country (by a specified majority of two-thirds or even three-fourths of the people who vote). The weight and role of the Presidium chairman will thereby grow considerably, although the collegial head of state will be retained at the same time. The Presidium will

make its decisions collegially. The chairman will, however, be able to exercise simultaneously his own influence and his right of veto, which must also be introduced. The power of the head of state will also be strong owing to the fact that its collegial nature is a considerable guarantee against recurrences of absolute rule.

That is one viewpoint, and I will not hide that I share it. But there is another. That it has many advocates is shown for instance by the very fact that the overwhelming majority of conference delegates expressed themselves in favor of it. I think that there will be many detailed articles in the press supporting it and millions of citizens will become thoroughly familiar with each argument. I will therefore limit myself to just a few thoughts. The chief one is that not everyone today has certainly yet fully realized the depth of the planned transformations, and people sometimes approach the assessment of them with yardsticks of acquired experience. And this experience makes every one of us very wary as soon as we sense in any respect a hint of another bout of unchecked authoritarianism.

However, if you examine the essence of the proposed innovations or, more precisely, if we manage to implement them, many of today's fears should be removed from our lives. We, for example, still do not know today what democratic selection of leaders really means, and yet it is this which will presumably bring to all levels of power figures of a new type who have gone through the multitiered sifting of competition and who abandoned authoritarian methods of management back at the distant approaches to their political career.

But it does no harm to beware of exaggerated hopes. It is therefore advisable to bear in mind that there always have been careerists, unprincipled people, and political scoundrels who will know how to get around any and every obstacle on the path to power. In their regard measures rigidly controlling absolute rule (on any scale, centrally or at local level) are vitally important for society and absolutely essential. But such measures are also beneficial in regard to conscientious, decent politicians, since they prevent any undesirable development of their personality, and are not onerous, since collegial work with personal responsibility for one's assigned task is most fully consonant with the collectivist nature of socialism.

From the Editorial Office:

The questions broached in these articles by Doctor of Juridical Sciences B. Kurashvili are not clear-cut and are in many respects new to public opinion. The author's proposals are therefore debatable.

However, these questions and proposals show once again the kind of in-depth, fundamental changes in the political and state structure to which the decisions of the 19th

party conference are leading Soviet society. And everyone must thoroughly investigate, consider, and discuss the process of their implementation. Here we cannot do without collective inquiry and an extensive exchange of opinion.

Criminal Investigation Official Views Resolution on Legal Reform

18000607 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 29 Jul 88 p 3

[Article by M. Kozhyevnikov, deputy chief, USSR MVD Main Investigation Administration: "To Cast Off Ambition"]

[Text] I believe that it would be timely to direct the readers' attention to one very important clause of the party conference resolution "On the Legal Reform." It was deemed expedient to concentrate the investigation of the basic body of criminal cases within the MVD investigative apparatus, which was separated into an independent structure, not subordinate to republic and local internal affairs authorities.

The democratization of Soviet society and the strengthening of the legal foundations of its life placed with all acuteness the question of restructuring the work of law enforcement agencies on the agenda. The goal is clear: ensuring the reliable defense of state interests and of citizens' rights, waging an effective struggle against crime and strengthening legality. Yet the achievement of these goals depends a great deal both on the organization of the preliminary investigation and on the creation of guarantees against interference by persons not empowered by law to do so. This, so to speak, is the "outline" of the problem.

How does the party conference recommend solving this problem? Primarily, by creating a unified investigative apparatus to investigate crimes of a general criminal nature. Today, according to law, these functions are assigned both to the prosecutor's office and to the internal affairs agencies, while clear demarcations—who is supposed to investigate which case—do not exist!

There is a certain concept—the type of investigation—which determines the competence (i.e., who gets which case) of the investigative apparatuses of the MVD and the prosecutor's office. However, clear and well-substantiated criteria are lacking. As a result, there is departmental disunity, parallelism and redundancy and endless arguments about this "type of investigation" itself. The time needed to investigate cases is increasing, profound and comprehensive analysis is made difficult, practice is generalized and forces and material resources are scattered. In the end, all of this hinders the struggle against crime. That is why the opinion which scientists and practical workers presented to the conference was almost unanimous: it would be expedient to unify the investigative apparatuses.

The party conference also declared quite definitely that the unified investigative apparatus should be part of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs. This issue sparked the broadest debates in the ensuing discussion. However, if we were detached from departmental ambitions, this decision would have been predetermined by life itself long ago.

The internal affairs agencies were given the right to perform the preliminary investigation by a USSR Supreme Soviet decree on 6 April, 1963. Created 25 years ago, to this day our investigative apparatus bears the basic work load, investigating 60 percent of crimes in which a preliminary investigation is required. The cadre has potential and has acquired much experience. (I hope that the reader understands me correctly: no few claims, fully justified, could still be made against us). However, today much has already been done to create a system for training investigative workers, capable of handling cases of any category of complexity and legal qualification. A great deal has been done to strengthen the scientific, methodical and material and technical foundation of investigation. No other law enforcement department today has such possibilities at its disposal.

Transferring the basic body of criminal cases to MVD investigators also simultaneously solves the long-standing problem of the real division of the investigation and the prosecutor's supervision over it. This solution finally makes the prosecutor's office objective, since the prosecutor is no longer held accountable for the investigator's work and can focus on the observation of guarantees of the investigation's legality and on the legal examination of criminal cases.

Of course, it would have been simpler not to "take" the additional work load upon ourselves. Truly, this does not promise us any advantages whatsoever—only great responsibility. However, the interests of the matter require it, which means that any "official" considerations (egotistical, narrow departmental ones) should be set aside.

Furthermore, I must state that consolidating the investigative apparatus within the USSR MVD requires additional legislative and organizational guarantees of its independence. At this time there is no legal act at the state level which defines the role and status of the investigative apparatus within the internal affairs agencies. The departmental acts passed at the turn of the 1960s-1970s gave the chiefs of internal affairs agencies the right of organizational control over investigators, in addition to the responsibility for the condition of investigative work.

The investigative apparatus became an administrative subordinate of the militia chief, which contradicts the norms of criminal-procedural legislation. A paradoxical situation formed, in which the investigator, possessing

by law the right to give instructions and directions to agencies of inquiry, cannot fully utilize this right, since it means giving instructions and directions... to his chief.

If one considers the investigator's dependency on the leaders of internal affairs agencies in terms of promotions and material, housing, and economic support, etc.—his procedural independence in working on a case, declared by law and departmental normative acts, has no real guarantees whatsoever.

The party conference has also recommended, it seems, the most optimal way to solve these urgent problems. Removing the investigators from the staffs of local and republic internal affairs agencies and forming independent investigative subdivisions in rayons, cities, oblasts, krays and republics, subordinate only to higher investigative agencies, brings the structure of the investigative apparatus into complete conformity with its legal base and creates the necessary guarantees for protecting investigators against unlawful intradepartmental interference in their activities. The drafting of the corresponding normative acts and stressed organizational work to implement them is next on the agenda.

13362

Justice Minister Interviewed on Legal Reform Resolution

PM0308142 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 31 Jul 88 Second Edition p 3

["Interview with USSR Minister of Justice B.V. Kravtsov" by unnamed TASS correspondent: "Way of Life and Letter of the Law"—date and place not given; first paragraph is introduction]

[Text] The concept of building a law-based state in the USSR, developed at the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference, has attracted the whole people's keen attention and unflagging interest. A TASS correspondent asked USSR Minister of Justice B.V. Kravtsov to comment on its basic provisions.

Question: One important task of restructuring, as the 19th All-Union Party Conference resolution "On Legal Reform" emphasizes, is to enhance the role of the courts within the system of socialist democracy. What tasks have to be resolved here?

Answer: The CPSU Central Committee plenum held 29 July determined specific steps for the practical implementation of the party conference resolutions, including the resolution on questions of judicial reform. The conference decided to restore Lenin's vision of the court's role in our society.

The conference deemed it necessary to significantly consolidate the guarantees for the implementation of democratic principles of the administration of justice

such as the adversarial principle, glasnost, strict adherence to the presumption of innocence, and impermissibility of either bias toward the prosecution or indulgence toward those who have infringed the law.

In order to accomplish this task, it is proposed to substantially amend the procedural legislation and to considerably expand the rights of those taking part in trials: specifically, to make provisions for the prosecutors' right to appeal sentences and decisions by the USSR Supreme Court or by union republic supreme courts and the right to appeal decisions in cases involving administrative offenses.

The conference resolution points out the need to enhance the court's prestige, to ensure absolute independence of judges and their subordination to the law alone, and to define specific penalties for interference in judicial activity and for contempt of court.

For this purpose, it is proposed that people's judges should be elected for a longer term than at present, say for 10 years, and that this should be done at sessions of superior soviets of people's deputies. In our opinion, this will create additional guarantees of judges' independence from outside pressure. Candidate judges will certainly have to meet higher demands from the viewpoint of their professional training and their general human qualities alike.

The paramount tasks must also include the organizational and technical support of courts, the building of special premises, the material support of court personnel, and the training and further training of cadres.

The courts' role can be enhanced only if all the aforementioned questions are resolved.

Question: The resolution also speaks of the need to substantially enhance the role of justice organs and to consolidate the juridical services of soviets of people's deputies, ministries and departments, and economic organizations. How do you perceive the ways to solve this task?

Answer: It is not only citizens who need to have their legitimate rights and interests protected. The conditions of economic reform create numerous legal problems for industrial and agricultural enterprises and cooperatives. It is here, of course, that juridical services will have a greater role to play. After all, the primary purpose of these services is to help in consolidating contract and labor discipline, improving the quality of goods and services, and protecting the legitimate interests of enterprises, organizations, and citizens. The intelligent organization of legal work and precise collaboration among all services—this is the basis of the successes of restructuring innovators like N. Travkin, V. Starodubtsev, S. Fedorov, and others. It is not anarchy but order based on legal foundations and coupled with bold economic initiative that enables them to achieve high efficiency and results.

The USSR Ministry of Justice is studying advanced experience in the organization of legal work and is striving to disseminate it widely. Unfortunately, some ministries and departments are taking rather a long time to implement it.

The practical work of enterprises in the new conditions shows that at times it is the improper application of the law that retards the development of economic accountability and results in adverse financial consequences for enterprises and losses running into millions. After all, the USSR Law on the State Enterprise (Association) has given enterprises major powers to elaborate their own, so-called local normative acts on internal economic accountability in production, on the organization and remuneration of labor, and on the introduction of contractual forms.

We recently studied the state of legal work at Alma-Ata's 20-Letiya Oktyabrya Machine Tool Building Plant within the Ministry of the Machine Tool and Tool Building Industry system. It employs several thousand people, but only two of its teams have switched to economic accountability. The plant is losing millions through its failure to meet contract commitments. Ministry representatives have visited the plant on many occasions, including during the current year, but have failed to provide any effective assistance. Of course, the inordinately high volume of state orders has also played a certain role here. But the internal potential ought to be utilized much more fully.

Situations like this, when local normative acts are not elaborated, are fairly widespread. Enterprises and associations within the systems of the Gosstroys, Ministries of Light Industry, and Ministries of Communications in a number of union republics have been inspected, and the majority were found not to have elaborated their own provisions for economic accountability, while some had not even reviewed local normative documents.

What does this indicate? We are faced with the same chronic disease: We are waiting for something, relying on "big brother." True, some leaders experience difficulties in the organization of legal work and juridical services. It is our duty to help them in this work.

The USSR Ministry of Justice has practically taken on the role of coordinating center for providing methodological assistance and disseminating advanced experience in this work. The task is to ensure that work on the consolidation and, wherever necessary, the creation of juridical services is actively done everywhere by the appropriate ministries and departments and local soviets.

Question: In your view, what practical measures must be taken to enhance the role of the legal profession as a self-managing association for the provision of legal assistance to citizens, state enterprises, and cooperatives and for representing their interests in court and before other organs?

Answer: The restrictions curbing the growth of the size of lawyers' collegiums have been lifted. Proposals have been drafted to change the procedure governing payment for legal assistance.

Work is being done on draft amendments to the Law on the Legal Profession in the USSR, as well as draft directives on the legal profession in union republics. Our view of the innovations to be included in these acts? Let me cite some of them.

It is proposed, within the framework of the implementation of judicial reform, to expand the rights of lawyers as regards protecting citizens' legitimate rights, making provisions for their participation in preliminary investigations from an earlier stage and giving lawyers in civil proceedings the right to participate in preparing the case for trial.

Question: It is well known that the 19th All-Union Party Conference raised the question of providing cadres for the legal reform as an immediate task. What measures is the Ministry of Justice taking in this regard?

Answer: Yes, the professional training of those who will implement the reform and will work in the courts and the organs and institutions of justice is assuming paramount importance. Unfortunately, there are quite a few gaps here today. Work is now being done to elaborate and improve a system for the selection, education, training, and further training of juridical cadres. Specifically, it is envisaged to expand the base of the All-Union Institute for Improving the Training of Justice Officials. There is a pressing need to reorganize the republican institutes' courses for further training.

I have already spoken about the new demands made on candidates for the office of people's judges and lawyers. I would like to add that there are proposals to elect to higher courts jurists who have had at least 5 years of experience in their specialized sphere, including at least 3 years as judges.

Other specific measures will be taken to consolidate the membership of all categories of juridical cadres and enhance their professional competence.

Question: It is well known that the CPSU Central Committee February (1988) Plenum set the task of organizing universal juridical education as a unified comprehensive statewide program covering all strata of the population and all cadres, both central and local. The need to take effective measures for the restructuring of the population's legal education and the organization of universal juridical education was also emphasized by the 19th all-union conference. What specific work has been done to implement this task?

Answer: We have already taken certain steps in this direction. The interested ministries, state committees, departments, public organizations, scientific institutions, and educational establishments have been involved in drafting proposals for the fundamental improvement of legal education and the organization of universal juridical education, and a statewide comprehensive program for the population's universal juridical education is under preparation.

Some positive experience in improving the legal training of economic leaders, party and state apparatus officials, people's deputies, and the public has already been accumulated in Sverdlovsk Oblast, the Mari ASSR, and other republics and oblasts in the country.

The organization of universal juridical education is dictated by practical requirements and the need to

ensure the law's supremacy in all spheres of society's life. The observance of legality must become a way of life rather than just a one-shot campaign. It is obvious that people must know and understand the laws if they are to observe them. Soviet citizens need access to information about current legislation and explanations of the norms of labor, housing, civil, and criminal law and other acts having the force of laws.

Life has already taught us on many occasions that ignorance of, and even more so contempt for, the law has cost our society and citizens all too dearly. A law-based state will remain nothing but a dream without universal juridical education, without the broad masses of working people being thoroughly familiar with the fundamentals of the law.

PRAVDA Carries Editorial on Conference Resolutions

18000544a Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Jul 88 p 1

[Editorial: "Deepening Restructuring Resolutions of the All-Union Party Conference"]

[Text] We have been traveling the road of renewal for more than 3 years now, a road started by the CPSU Central Committee April Plenum. We have been working to implement the decisions of the 27th party congress. What kind of a time has this been for Soviet Communists, our people, and the entire country?

The answer to these fundamental questions was provided by the 19th all-union party conference. Its resolution "On the Progress in Implementing the Decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the Tasks of Deepening Restructuring," adopted on the basis of the report by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, states that the strategic course of the comprehensive and revolutionary renewal of Soviet society and the acceleration of its socioeconomic development is being steadily implemented.

Well, each of us can see for ourselves the correctness of the party's conclusions by comparing what existed in the past with what we have now. The country had slid into an economic and sociopolitical crisis; this has now been halted. People believed in restructuring, adopted it, and are advocating that it be deepened and that the revolutionary transformations be made irreversible.

A great deal has changed in our life. Democratization and glasnost have become firm parts of its ideological, political, and social atmosphere. The process of improving the country's economy and switching it toward satisfying people's urgent needs has started. New economic management methods are gaining ground. We recall that the USSR laws on state enterprise and the cooperative system, the transition of labor collectives to economic accountability [khozraschet], self-financing, contracts and leases, and individual labor activity have all recently appeared on the scene, substantially changing production relations and creating favorable conditions for effective economic management. The first results of the work that has been done are now noticeable. This work has made it possible to restore growth to working people's real incomes, and to renew foreign policy and make it more dynamic.

What has been done is just the beginning. We can all feel how difficult, complex, and contradictory the restructuring processes are, and how acute the confrontation between old and new. Although positive trends are evident, there has not been a fundamental breakthrough in economic, social, and cultural development. The braking mechanism has not yet been completely dismantled and replaced by an acceleration mechanism. The economy largely continues to move along extensive lines, and its structure remains largely expenditure oriented.

The conference noted that scientific and technical progress is being implemented only slowly and that the plans to increase national income and ensure resource saving are not being carried out. There has been no noticeable improvement in output quality. The country's financial position remains complex. This is all reflected (how could it not be!) on the shelves in our stores, in the state of the services sphere, and in the acute housing problem.

What are the reasons for this situation? Of course, the legacy of stagnation exerts a restraining influence on restructuring. That, however, is not the whole story. A great deal, the conference stated, is rooted in the shortcomings of the current work of party, state, and economic organs and social organizations. In various areas of society, including labor collectives, attitudes toward work have not changed. Conscientious fulfillment of obligations by everyone has still not become the norm. Many leaders are unwilling or unable to give up methods of administration by edict.

None of us can fail to notice the force with which the conference voiced the question of striving above all to substantially improve the country's food supply. This, the first resolution noted, is a major sociopolitical question. But it is being resolved in different ways in different places. Convincing examples were cited from the rostrum of neighboring regions with identical natural and economic conditions producing different results. Why, for instance, was it possible to improve food supplies to the population in Belgorod Oblast when this was not done in neighboring Kursk Oblast? Why have rural working people in Tselinograd Oblast increased supplies of meat, milk, and vegetables to the trading system, while this has not been done in North Kazakhstan and certain other neighboring oblasts?

The reasons are to be found in the different approaches to the development of kolkhoz and sovkhoz potential. Now they must all switch to new economic management principles. This means that any attempts to issue commands to kolkhozes and sovkhozes should be stopped, urgent measures should be taken to improve the transportation, processing, storage, and sales of agricultural produce, and efficient use should be made of the funds allocated for retooling and building enterprises in these sectors. A great deal will have to be done to bring about the social restructuring of the countryside and to improve rural working and living conditions.

In order to accelerate the saturation of the market with different goods and services we will have to fundamentally retool light industry and other sectors producing consumer goods. In the interests of the people, wider use should be made of local resources and the potential of the cooperative movement and individual labor activity.

The conference approved the measures taken to sharply increase the volume of pace of housing construction and improve its quality, with a view to fulfilling the task set

by the 27th CPSU Congress: to provide an individual apartment or house for virtually every family by the year 2000. The unconditional implementation of the programs adopted on health care, environmental protection, and the improvement of the ecological situation in the country were recognized as important tasks.

The social reorientation of the economy should become the core of all structural and investment policy. It is also proposed to increase people's interest in the highest end results, preventing a situation in which people can get away with poor performance. A reform of price formation will be carried out after a nationwide discussion, revising wholesale, purchase, and retail prices. It has been decided to proceed firmly on the basis of the principle that a price change should not harm people's living standards.

Revolutionary restructuring is impossible without the comprehensive galvanization of society's intellectual and spiritual potential, without scientific and technical progress, without increasing the scientific and technical contribution of science and engineering cadres, without modern standards in the entire educational system, and without an increase in the people's general and political culture. The conference advocated the further democratization of science and culture. Fundamental importance was attached to stepping up restructuring's theoretical arsenal, renewing ideological work, and freeing it from routine, vacuity, and cliché.

Probably everyone who followed the conference's day-to-day work noted the considerable role of questions of youth education in the discussion. The adopted resolution calls for a consistent, accelerated implementation of the reform of secondary and higher education. The party sees young people as an active and enterprising force in restructuring, considers it necessary to have an integrated state policy with respect to the rising generation, and advocates the complete restoration of the Leninist traditions of party leadership of the Komsomol. The Komsomol bears a particular responsibility to all society for its work in the Pioneer movement, the initial school of civic life and mortality.

Reform of the political system has been put on the agenda. This is a wide-ranging and meaningful concept. The demarcation of the functions of party and state organs and the rebirth of the authority of the soviets from top to bottom are of key importance. This is ultimately aimed, together with the reform of the judicial system and other institutions ensuring the regulation of relations between the state and citizens, at concluding the creation of a socialist legal state, in which the supreme principle will be the unconditional subordination of everything and everyone to the law. It is planned to periodically convene congresses of USSR people's deputies, to hold sessions of a bicameral Supreme Soviet on a regular basis, and to institute the post of chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The conference has

planned a renewal in the spirit of the restructuring of the activity of public organizations and associations, including trade union, Komsomol, women's and veterans' groups, and others.

The CPSU has undertaken the revolutionary initiative of restructuring. It has thus demonstrated yet again that it is the bearer of our programmatic goals and acts as the vanguard of the people. With the delineation of the functions of party and state organs, there should be a complete rebirth of the Leninist concept of the party as society's vanguard. Relying on Marxist-Leninist teaching, this ensures the theoretical elaboration of the most important questions of the country's development, works out the ideology of restructuring, and, through organizational work among the masses, inspiring and rousing them, moves our entire multinational society forward in the correct socialist direction. The party carries out cadre policy and implements its political line via Communists working in state and economic organs, social organizations, and labor collectives. And, the conference stressed, the party operates within the framework of the Constitution and Soviet laws. The resolution states that the CPSU will never henceforth permit any repetition of anything similar to what happened in the periods of the personality cult and stagnation.

Approving the CPSU Central Committee's international activity based on new political thinking, the conference reaffirmed that only a political approach to resolving the contradictions of world development and the settlement of conflict situations opens up for the USSR the possibility of playing its predestined role in ensuring mankind's survival and further progress. The Soviet leadership's approach to the problem of removing the threat of war through frank and constructive dialogue and disarmament—which opened the way to the conclusion of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles and to a movement of the talks on nuclear, chemical, and conventional arms into the realm of practicalities—was deemed correct. The decision to withdraw troops from Afghanistan on the basis of the Geneva accords is of great importance.

One of the provisions of the first resolution adopted by the conference is that foreign economic activity should make an increasing contribution to releasing the country's resources for peaceful building. Restructuring needs a foreign policy that fully reflects its humanist essence and offers the Soviet Union broad prospects of mutually advantageous cooperation and multifaceted democratic links with the surrounding world. The CPSU's course of invariable solidarity with the struggle of communist and workers parties and all social forces for peace, social progress, freedom, and democracy has been reaffirmed.

Reflecting the will of the 20-million strong army of Communists and the Soviet people's fundamental interests, the conference stated that the party will persistently and purposefully deepen the process of revolutionary

restructuring, make it irreversible, and do everything to achieve its goals. A call was heard for party organizations, Communists, and nonparty people to join even more actively in the processes of society's renewal processes which are of historic importance of the fate of the motherland. May everyone respond to that call with concrete deeds!

12232

PRAVDA Carries Editorial on Democratization Resolution

*PM1007172 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Jul 88
Second Edition p 1*

[Editorial under the rubric "All-Union Party Conference Resolutions": "The Democratization Program"]

[Text] Right up to the last minute of the conference problems of the democratization of society and radical reform of the political system were at the focus of the delegates' attention. The need for this reform has been dictated by the more than 3 years of experience of restructuring. Since April 1985 the party has been resolutely struggling for the renewal of sociopolitical structures. This can be felt and seen. However, the processes of democratization—both at the center and at local level—have so far been progressing slowly.

"The task now," the conference resolution "On the Democratization of Soviet Society and the Reform of the Political System" says, "is to ensure that Soviet statehood fully matches that concept and that all affairs in the country are decided by the people and their plenipotentiary representatives and are under the people's full and effective control."

The key concern is to ensure the full power of the soviets. The main principle which is comprehensively set out in the aforementioned resolution could be briefly summed up as follows: Not one question of state, economic, or sociocultural life can be resolved without the soviets. During the formation of ispolkoms and of the lineup of leaders of sections and services, the nomination of several candidates, secret balloting, and election on a competitive basis are henceforth to become the rule. A number of important democratic rules are being introduced, including the limitation of the tenure of elective posts and posts that require confirmation by the soviets to two successive terms. It has been decided to substantially restructure the electoral system.

The conference expressed itself in favor of electing permanent presidiums in local organs of power, with the exception of rural and settlement soviets, and the chairmen of all soviets without exception by secret ballot. The recommendation, as a rule, of first secretaries of party committees to the posts of chairmen of the corresponding soviets would contribute to the enhancement of the

role of the representative organs, the resolution notes. This is a question of boosting the authority of the reborn soviets with the authority of the party.

Having generalized the results of the discussion on the CPSU Central Committee Theses and the exchange of views at the conference, the delegates deem it necessary to carry out a reconstruction of the top organs of state power. The supreme organ of state power is to be the annual congress of USSR people's deputies. According to the collectively conceived plan it is to form a numerically relatively small bicameral USSR Supreme Soviet—a permanently functioning legislative, executive, and control organ—and elect the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet by secret ballot. It is necessary to eliminate the loss of functional identity of the chambers and to organize the work of the standing commissions and the deputies along new lines. New approaches are also to be used in the establishment and the organization of the work of soviets at all other levels.

One of the main spheres of the reform of the political system is the decentralization of administration and a reallocation of functions and powers which will ensure maximum initiative and independence at local level. Here care must be taken to avoid a narrow departmental approach and local favoritism and to safeguard the functions of the center. The democratization of society presupposes systematic work to strengthen the structure and improve the methods of the functioning of the entire state apparatus. It is necessary to have an apparatus of a new type. The conference expressed itself for the accelerated creation of such an apparatus, for ensuring that not a single link of the administrative system remains outside the sphere of restructuring.

The formation of a socialist legal state has been described as a matter of fundamental importance. Highly evaluating the activity of public organizations, the conference expressed itself in favor of the democratization of their life, enhancement of their independence and responsibility, and overcoming of stage-management, formalism, and other shortcomings. A constantly functioning mechanism of free dialogue, criticism and self-criticism, and self-control and self-evaluation is vitally important in the party and society.

The success of the reform of the political system will depend to a decisive degree on the work of the party. All its organizations and all the Communists are called upon to play a most active, creative part in the solution of the new tasks. The CPSU as the initiator and executor of the reform has in practice the mission of the political vanguard of the working class and all the working people. It is important fully to translate into reality the Leninist concept of the leading role of the party. This makes it necessary for party committees to stop doing the work of state and economic organs and to renounce methods of work based on issuing commands and instructions.

In short, without profound democratization of the party's internal life, the CPSU's vanguard role in restructuring is impossible. It is necessary to fully restore the Leninist concept of the principle of democratic centralism which provides for the freedom of debate at the discussion stage and unity of action once decisions have been adopted by the majority. Measures must be elaborated and implemented to deepen internal party democracy with a view to ensuring that all components of the CPSU operate in an atmosphere of party comradeship, openness, criticism and self-criticism, collectivism, and conscious discipline.

The conference attaches great importance to the democratization of the life of primary party organizations and the enhancement of their independence. It is necessary to rid basic components of the CPSU of petty regimentation from above and to strengthen the authority of the elected organs and primary organization secretaries. It will be necessary to overcome the passiveness of a certain section of party members. It was frankly stated from the conference rostrum that the level of involvement of Communists in the work of party committees does not match the requirements of the radical restructuring of party work. The admission of new members into the CPSU also requires democratization.

One of the key avenues of the democratization of the party is the full restoration of the Leninist principle of collective discussion and adoption of decisions. It is impermissible for the party apparatus to supplant elected organs, and for the role of Communists to be reduced to attending meetings and voting for lists of proposed candidates and finished draft resolutions. It is necessary to change the nature of meetings and plenums and to enhance their effectiveness.

The conference expressed itself for expanding the participation of CPSU Central Committee members in the work of the Central Committee Politburo, for regular Politburo accounts and briefings to be delivered at Central Committee plenums, and for the establishment of commissions dealing with various spheres and consisting of Central Committee members. The democratization of the life of the party demands maximum openness in the work of all its organizations and leading components. Attention is drawn in particular to the need for regular accounts to be delivered by raykom, gorkom, okrug committee, obkom, kraykom, and union republic Communist Party Central Committee bureaus to their committees and by party committees and party bureaus to primary and shop-floor organizations. At the same time Communists have the right to recall from elective organs before their term is up those who fail to cope with their duties or who have compromised themselves.

The conference defined ways for a serious renewal of the party's cadre policy in conditions of democratization. The formal, nomenklatura-based approach to the selection and placement of cadres is on the way out. The organization of training and retraining of people and

their education with a view to their possible recommendation to leading posts in accordance with democratic procedures are becoming the main method of the work of party committees in this sphere.

A question of paramount importance is the democratization of the electoral process in the party. The task has been set of ensuring the broad discussion of candidacies, secret balloting, and the possibility of the inclusion on the ballot papers of a greater number of candidates than there are seats in the elections of members and secretaries of all committees up to and including the CPSU Central Committee. When electing delegates to a conference or a congress party organizations are authorized to submit candidacies for the superior organ, with the conference or congress delegates retaining the last word in this matter. The proposal for a uniform term of office—5 years for elected organs from the CPSU Central Committee down to raykoms—has won support. There is no denying that this is quite a long term. Therefore it is proposed to hold party conferences which will be authorized to partially renew the lineup of committees 2-3 years after the elections.

There was a great debate prior to the conference about the tenure of elective posts. After weighing all the "pros" and "cons," the delegates deemed it advisable to introduce the rule under which all party committee bureau members and secretaries, including members of the Politburo and the CPSU Central Committee general secretary, can be elected to the same post for no more than two consecutive terms. This is a most important safeguard against stagnation in the cadre corps.

It is envisaged to substantially improve control and auditing work in the party. To this end, and also to provide reliable safeguards against subjectivism and arbitrariness and against personal and chance circumstances impinging on party policy, it is proposed to create a unified control organ—the CPSU Central Control and Auditing Commission—and similar bodies at local level, and to dismantle the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee and the CPSU Central Auditing Commission and the corresponding commissions at local level.

The reform of the political system, the conference resolution notes, means a great deal of intensive work. It will necessitate the adoption of responsible party decisions and major legislative acts, including the introduction of substantial amendments to the USSR Constitution and the constitutions of union and autonomous republics and the CPSU Statutes. The reform must be comprehensive and all-embracing. It will have to be implemented in a coordinated fashion, in step with the restructuring of the economy and the whole society. And what is more, implemented without delay and within the shortest possible time.

This year's report and election campaign which is to be carried out in accordance with the decisions of the 19th all-union party conference on the reform of the political system and the democratization of the life of the CPSU will be an exacting test for party committees and all Communists. The reorganization of the party apparatus and the introduction of the necessary changes in its structure taking account of the decisions on the division of functions between the party and the soviets are also to be carried out before the end of the year. These are only the immediate tasks. It is the Communists' duty to do everything to ensure that the outlined measures become reality.

IZVESTIYA Runs Editorial on Post-Conference Political Reform

18000544c Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
7 Jul 88 p 1

[Editorial: "19th Party Conference on Political System Reform"]

[Text] Alluding to historical parallels, someone said this of the 19th party conference: "Four days that shook the world." But let us leave comparisons and assessments to our descendants. Let us ask ourselves honestly and without evaluation: What have these 4 days changed in the life of the party and the people? Is there a difference between the state in which our society found itself on the eve of the conference and the one it is in now, after it?

If we cast aside details and emotions, if we renounce assessments of the words spoken and comparisons of the more and less vivid speeches, in short, if we single out the chief aspect and assess it with historical yardsticks, the difference is tremendous and fundamental. Previously, (or almost unanimous) in its understanding of what must be done: It was necessary finally to decide on the dismantling of the administrative-edict system—we realized that without this extraordinary measures equal to a revolution it was impossible to destroy the braking mechanisms, and so restructuring too was impossible. Today, after the conference we know how to do this, in what way, and precisely which political system to create.

Let us tell ourselves honestly: Over a very long time and too indecisively, overcoming our own fears and the dogmas which had arisen over many years, unforgivably losing time and purpose, we made our way to the essence, to the heart of the matter, not daring to admit that the political system was at the root of everything. But precisely because it was necessary to tackle fundamentals, we frightened one another with the danger of departing from socialism, despite the failures which were repeating themselves and the growing difficulties. Instead of admitting that the political system created as a result of the October victory had subsequently been subjected to serious deformations which had distorted the face of socialism, we endured Stalin's absolute power and the repression and lawlessness to which millions of people were subjected. All the good impulses in the

economy and the desire to improve the people's life and meet their elementary needs ended in the new failures and new promises of future successes.

We knew what we wanted. We did not know how to achieve it. Attempts to modernize the system that had been created, that is, to bring the administrative-edict methods of management to perfection, produced results that were the direct opposite of what was expected: Management structures proliferated sharply, ministries and departments multiplied, and the bureaucratic apparatus controlled literally everything, subjecting absolutely everything to its control. As a result, there was increasing diktat and regimentation in all spheres of production, of public and spiritual... But the more tightly society was fettered by chains of detailed regimentation of economic management, the more slowly the wheels turned, sinking deeper and deeper into the swamp of stagnation.

Having proclaimed the policy of restructuring, the party not only did not itself avoid answering extremely difficult and painful questions and not only evaluated honestly and unstintingly the path traveled but also engaged by way of democracy and glasnost society's entire intellectual potential to seek new paths. And it is naive, to say the least, to claim that, if this conference had happened earlier, at the very start of restructuring, we would be far advanced today. If we had ventured such a step, we would have been thrown back umpteen times, because a year ago not only society but also the party were not yet ready for such a formulation of the question—the radical reform of the political system.

Even now, after the stormy polemics that developed in all corners of the country for several months prior to the party conference, after the clash of opinions over every point in the Central Committee Theses, after the sharp debate in the Palace of Congresses itself, even now it is still possible to see confusion in assessments and opinions—from "too radical" to "not decisive enough," from customary delight to groundless disappointment. And this is natural, for new things have a difficult birth and enter the public awareness with equal difficulty. But the chief conclusion is obvious: Thanks to the tremendous efforts of the party and the entire people, we managed in a very short but inevitably necessary time to overcome disunity of views and mutually exclusive assessments and arrived, before the conference, at a realization of the causes of braking in the past and the present.

Let us repeat: Before the conference we already knew what must be done. Today we know when, how, and in what way: The conference formulated and adopted a program to implement the reform of the country's political system.

It was stated at the conference that the party must irrevocably abandon edict and command methods. The task has been set of clearly delimiting the functions of party and state organs in accordance with the Leninist

concept of the role of the Communist Party as the political vanguard of society and the role of the Soviet state as the organization and tool of the people's power. State organs are not to be supplanted, and the trade unions, the Komsomol, other public organizations, and creative and other unions are not to be ordered around. Their policy is to be implemented through organizational, cadre, and ideological work with strictest observance of the Soviet laws and the democratic principles of public life. As though replying to possible doubts—will the party's role not be weakened here?—it was resolutely stated from the rostrum of the 19th party conference: No, no! "Remaining the ruling party, the party possesses all the necessary levers to realize its leading role. And chief among these are the 20 million communists through whom the party pursues its political course in all spheres of the life of society."

The conferences deemed it necessary to strengthen the soviets' legislative, managerial, and control functions, to submit all important questions of state, economic, and sociocultural life for their examination and resolution, and to restore the leading position of elective organs with regard to executive organs and their apparatus. It was emphasized that the party's policy—economic, social, national—must be implemented, above all, through organs of the people's representation.

There is hardly any point in reviewing the program for the country's political reorganization adopted by the conference—there is a resolution about this that indicates the main areas of activity. And so we will not speak of the new structure and role of party organs and soviets at all levels of the system of elections, of holding more than one post simultaneously, of subordination, and so forth—each of these questions merits special discussion and analysis, particularly as the details will be amplified as we go along, and life and living practice will undoubtedly pose new problems and demand amendments.

Let us turn our attention to the decisiveness with which the party has set about realizing the conference guidelines without delay. The vigorous nature of the actions is the fundamental issue. Unfortunately, this too has entered our flesh and blood—having adopted correct decisions, we are accustomed to supposing that the thing has thereby already been done, and we are able to drag out for years what must be fitted into days and months. There can be no doubt that this time too there were many people who figured that the old structure and the old approaches would suffice for their lifetime. But the further course of events should dispel illusions where they exist: Following the main resolution on this question, the conference adopted the special resolution "On Some Urgent Measures for the Practical Implementation of the Reform of the Country's Political System." A report and election campaign will take place in party organizations this year, the party apparatus will be reorganized, draft legislative acts for the restructuring of soviet organs will be examined, and in April 1989 elections and a congress of people's deputies will be held.

Yes, restructuring is calculated for the long term. Yes, we have set ourselves revolutionary goals, and the mass of work will inevitably take time. Yes, there are questions doubts, and vagueness. But marking time, the endless experiments into which we have been pushed this time too, and endless talk are not politics. Or, if you like, this would be a policy of stagnation in an atmosphere of glasnost. Politics is not only thought but also, above all, action, and we must accomplish the maximum possible in every historical space of time. Not delaying nor giving way in the face of anything new and difficult.

Soviet people can see that just such an approach is triumphing today. A Politburo session was held immediately after the conference at which, in addition to other urgent decisions dictated by the conference, it was deemed necessary to convene a CPSU Central Committee plenum this very month. Instructions were issued to prepare in time for the plenum proposals connected with implementing the reform of the political system and the democratization of party, state, and public life.

The decisions adopted at the conference must not be perceived separately—only the totality, the package of measures for the restructuring of society, and consistency in every area can lead to the goal. But there is an obligatory condition for all spheres of life, whether the economy, law and order, or the spiritual sphere—democratization. Only given this condition will we ensure that Soviet statehood fully accords with the concept of the state of the whole people, when all affairs in the country are decided by the people and their plenipotentiary representatives and are under their complete and effective control. Today it will no longer depend on the system but on every one of us whom we nominate for organs of party and state power, whether we will be able to uphold candidates whom we trust, and whether we learn to vote holding ourselves, above all, responsible for the results with regard to any issue—ourselves above all and chiefly, for this is what people's power means, power for each and everyone.

12232

PRAVDA Carries Editorial on Antibureaucracy Resolution

*PM1307134 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Jul 88
First Edition p 1*

[Editorial under the rubric "Resolutions of the All-Union Party Conference": "Pensioning Off Bureaucracy"; capitalization as published]

[Text] One of the main instructions issued to delegates of the 19th all-union party conference was to declare merciless war on bureaucracy. And that is no accident, since it was sluggishness, bureaucracy, indifference, and perfunctoriness regarding people that became a major, grinding brake on restructuring and an obstacle to the development of glasnost, to the exasperation of the masses. The numbing bonds of bureaucracy fetter the

initiative and vital creativity of the masses, be it in the national economy, where economic methods of production management are being introduced, or in the social sphere, sociopolitical life, and the spiritual and moral development of society.

That is why the resolution "On Combating Bureaucracy," which was passed unanimously at the conference, engenders a sense of satisfaction in most Soviet people. It is seen as the natural outcome of restructuring and as an important result of the effective offensive launched against this social evil since the Central Committee April (1985) Plenum. The party has uttered a decisive "no" to such distortions as diktat and administrative arbitrariness in the economy and the social and spiritual spheres, bureaucratic indifference to people's rights and needs, and a disdainful attitude toward public opinion and working people's social experience.

All these painful growths—the outcome of the lamentable period of stagnation and the fettering of democratic institutions—are incompatible with the aims and tasks of the revolutionary renewal of society. Virtually everyone of us has come up against the barrier of bureaucracy to some extent or other and knows how difficult it is to move it aside. A really implacable struggle must be waged here and persistent efforts made by the party and the people, since even today many initiatives and measures to transform the economy and other aspects of the life of the country are still paralyzed by the resistance mounted by the bureaucratic apparatus. Exploiting the passivity of many party organizations and soviets, the canny bureaucrat artfully latches on to restructuring, hiding behind a barricade of instructions and orders of every kind that assure him a comfortable existence. His tactics were aptly described by P. Petrovskiy from Odessa in his letter to PRAVDA as recalling the popular saying that a snake changes its skin, but not its nature.

The all-union conference not only denounced the pollution of bureaucracy and called for a consistent, uncompromising struggle to be launched against it but also, and this is the chief thing, formulated an all-embracing system of measures to eradicate it.

In the ECONOMY this means the absolute execution of the laws on the enterprise and the cooperative system and energetic activity on the part of labor collective councils. It means the development of economically accountable relations, independence, and responsibility on the part of enterprises, and contractual, lease, and cooperative forms of management. It means increasing production democracy and improving the organizational structures of management.

In the SOCIAL SPHERE this means showing greater concern to satisfy working people's material, consumer, and spiritual needs, consistently implementing the principle of social justice, and precisely executing the laws.

In SOCIOPOLITICAL LIFE the deepening of democracy, the extensive development of socialist self-management, and the strengthening of the power of the soviets are leading to success in combating bureaucratism. It is essential to resist attempts to replace democratic centralism by bureaucratic centralism and to ensure working people's direct involvement in drafting and carrying out state decisions. And, of course, it is essential to ensure the population is better informed and step up the people's monitoring of management organs' activity.

Finally, in the SPIRITUAL AND MORAL sphere the offensive against bureaucracy means a revival of the Leninist traditions and criteria of spiritual life, the creative use and development of Marxist-Leninist ideology, the establishment of new political thinking, and intolerance of manifestations of dogmatism, petit bourgeois morality, social parasitism, and abuse of office. It means creating a situation where opinions and views are freely counterposed and overcoming petty supervision and recrudescences of the command style in the leadership of science and culture.

The resolution stresses that if it is to engage all the forces of society in the struggle against bureaucracy and be successful, the party must set a convincing example of democratizing its own activity and party life and of eliminating the bureaucratic accretions. And that means that all party organizations and all Communists must live and act in that way. People will judge the effectiveness of this struggle, become energetically involved in it, and strive for practical results on the basis of their specific deeds and actions. It is necessary to raise to a qualitatively new level verification of the actual execution of decisions and the political directives of the party, particularly in the political organizations of ministries, departments, and other establishments directly concerned with meeting people's needs and requirements. No single party organization or official should be exempt from monitoring.

The PRAVDA editorial office is receiving many letters that cite a number of examples of bureaucratic distortions, and some people, it must be admitted, no longer believe that these distortions can be overcome. Granted, you will not really achieve anything here by acting impulsively, nor will matters be rectified by mechanical reorganizations. Only consistent, steady implementation of all the measures outlined by the party holds the promise of real victory. And the task today is to subject their implementation to monitoring by all the party and all the people. It is particularly important to ensure monitoring of the apparatus' work by working people and absolute observance of the principle that the management apparatus serves and is wholly accountable to elected organs, soviet power, and the people.

The mechanism to ensure this accountability and monitoring is provided for: Namely, organizing the reception of citizens by leadership officials directly in the labor

collectives, officials' reporting back to people in enterprises and at their place of residence, and the discussion and assessment of the apparatus' work at assemblies and meetings and in public organizations. The leaders of party organizations, up to and including Central Committee secretaries, must meet regularly with Communists and working people.

Real contact between leaders and people rather than platform speeches, and the ability to listen to people's opinion and inquiries, to take them into account in practical work, to learn from useful experience and help develop and disseminate it—all this must become the norm in our life. It must always be remembered that the work of leading cadres, their deeds and actions, are under the gaze of the masses, that the demands placed on every apparatus official are higher than ever before, and that the importance of managerial decisions has increased.

Competence in organizing work is of particular importance today. As the 19th all-union party conference resolution noted, serious changes are required in the actual procedure for formulating and making managerial decisions, it must be simplified and freed of hedging agreements, while at the same time alternative solutions to the most important economic and social problems must be submitted to the expert examination of scientists and public and nationwide discussion or referendum. While developing collective decisionmaking it is also necessary to further enhance workers' responsibility for their assigned task, to involve the management apparatus in the system of new economic ties, and to provide for its material liability for the consequences of decisions made. Managerial functions and powers must increasingly be transferred downward, actually into the labor collectives, so that their councils and all working people may fully exercise their rights.

Alongside blunt criticism of the apparatus conference, delegates' speeches also contained justified appeals to preserve and strengthen the leader's authority. This was reflected in the resolution, which set the task of extensively developing cadre training and retraining, substantially improving their managerial standards, and ensuring that their selection and placement is conducted openly on a competitive, contested basis; while at the same time making greater demands on leaders, resolutely jettisoning those who display a perfunctory work attitude and callousness and indifference to people's needs, and thwarting attempts to simply shift them to other leading posts. Party organizations, soviets, and other representative organs expressing the will of Communists and the whole people have the crucial say here.

Real sovereignty of the people and the extensive involvement of working people in the management of state and public affairs are the crucial factor in eradicating bureaucracy. The creation of an integrated system of public and state monitoring which will rely on the initiative and activeness of the masses and public organizations is also

intended to serve this purpose. Every citizen must be sure that he will find redress against bureaucrats in the soviets and organs of people's control, that the trade unions or Komsomol will defend his interests, and that the law-enforcement agencies will reliably protect him against administrative arbitrariness and violations of rights and freedoms. It is envisaged that legal conditions be created to step up the struggle against bureaucracy and that the practical application of the USSR law on judicial appeal against actions by officials infringing citizens' rights be improved. The mass media must supply more effective assistance to energetic, efficacious work designed to eradicate bureaucracy and to reveal its sources and manifestations and instructive examples of the struggle against it.

Excluding bureaucracy from our life is how one might briefly express the main thrust of the measures to combat this social ill adopted by the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference. Its success lies in our hands, it depends on the activeness, principledness, and persistence of each and every one of us.

IZVESTIYA Editorializes on Party Role in Reform

PM1207090 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Jul 88 Morning Edition p 1

[Editorial: "19th Party Conference on Society's Political Vanguard"]

[Text] Restructuring is gaining speed. Society's renewal has become not just the slogan of the day, but a spiritual impulse for millions and millions of people and the essence of their thoughts and actions. Who is heading this popular tide! Who is shouldering the main burden of the historic changes? Again, as at the time of a most crucial choice in the life of the people and the country, one remembers Lenin's phrase: There is such a party!

It is the party of Lenin, the party of Soviet Communists. It is the party that, after an uncompromising analysis of serious mistakes and our great achievements and having assimilated the past and the future, put forward the courageous idea of restructuring. It is the party that has led the people to overcome what was hampering us and dragging us backward, and it is the party that proposed the program of revolutionary changes and the improvement of socialism as Lenin understood it. It is the party that, gearing society to purification and democratization, started first and foremost with itself. And that is why the resources of people's confidence in it are not exhausted.

The question of the party's role as political vanguard was naturally at the center of the 19th party conference's attention. How could it be otherwise? After all, under the new conditions of the life of society and the party it is the party's prestige that will be seriously tested first of all. This prestige has to be proved each time with concrete action and everyday work among the masses, with the

masses, and for the masses. The activity of any party organization can only be assessed as a real improvement of matters. And, of course, for every party member passivity in anything is henceforth anathema—the forefront is the only place for Communists.

The conference showed that the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress, enriched by the existing experience of restructuring, are a clear-cut program for the party's action. The people support restructuring, accept its policy, and will not allow it to be reversed. The decisions before and at the conference and the thought given to the conference documents convince us that Soviet people believe in the party and its collective reason, and see it as their guide along the path of renewal.

At the new stage of socialist society's life the party's leading and organizational role is not only not being weakened, but is being enhanced still further; the fulfillment of this role will henceforth be assessed by new criteria, including self-purification, resolve in restructuring matters, democratization and glasnost in intraparty life, and the degree of contact with the people. The party's place in society and its duty to society are clearly defined in the 19th party conference resolutions adopted after comprehensive and sometimes heated discussion. It was the consideration given to all opinions that made it possible to work out a unified view of the party's tasks today.

The conference stressed the importance of demarcating the functions of party and state organs as a demand of life. The rebirth of the soviets' authority is a key question of the day. But the Leninist concept of the party as society's vanguard is thereby also reborn. The party is responsible for the theoretical elaboration of the most important questions of the country's development. It is responsible for working out the ideology of restructuring, which, through organizational work among the masses, will give a correct socialist thrust to all society's progress. It is also responsible for cadre policy: the sensible placement of people via the democratic mechanisms of a transformed political system; after all, the CPSU pursues its line via Communists—both leaders and ordinary workers. And the party's unbreakable rule is that it operates within the framework of the Constitution and Soviet laws. Never again will it permit deformations of socialism such as occurred during the personality cult and the period of stagnation.

One of the manifestations of the party's vanguard role in practice has been its initiative to reform our political system. This initiative is based on the desire to prevent state and economic organs being undermined by party committees and to irrevocably abandon authoritarian [komandno-prikaznyy] work methods. Only conviction, inspiration, and example can be the working methods on which the ability and maturity of the party organization and all CPSU members will be judged.

The party is now restoring the Leninist concept of the principle of democratic centralism—freedom of discussion when debating issues and unity of action after majority adoption of decisions. Party comradeship, free discussion of all topical issues of politics and practice, criticism, self-criticism, collectivism, conscientious discipline, and personal responsibility all constitute the atmosphere in which all CPSU components should operate. The democratization of the life of primary party organizations is of great importance. The main thing is to strive to ensure that all party members become fighters for renewal.

How to shape the next generation of party ranks is a special question. The conference condemned the "quota approach" to the process and advocated that political stance, real participation in restructuring, attitude to work, and moral makeup be the main criterion in evaluating the qualities of a candidate member of the party. The party is people, and they must be selfless, ideologically convinced, and honest.

The conference resolutions contain constructive proposals on the nature of party organizations' activity, the utmost openness in their work, the renewal of intraparty relations, and the democratization of elections in the party. The formal nomenklatura-centered approach to cadre policy must be replaced by training and retraining people and educating them taking account of possible recommendations for leading posts in accordance with democratic procedures. The voters will decide whether to elect them or not. As a most important guarantee against stagnation within the party's cadre corps it has been deemed expedient henceforth to nominate Communists, including members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and the general secretary of the Central Committee, to a post for no more than two consecutive terms. It is planned to set up a unified organ—the CPSU Central Control and Auditing Commission—to improve control and auditing work within the party and provide reliable guarantees against subjectivism, arbitrariness, and the influence of personal or incidental circumstances on party policy.

Under the conditions of restructuring and the delineation of the functions of party committees from those of state and economic organs a very great deal depends on the changes in the party apparatus. They must be implemented as quickly as possible by reorganizing the apparatus' structure, cutting it, and strictly subordinating it to elective organs. That is the will of the conference.

The party and every Communist are entrusted with the difficult but honorable duty of utilizing the conditions of restructuring to wage an uncompromising and consistent struggle, as is stated in the special conference resolution, "against the social pollution of bureaucratism." The aim is to ensure high quality in the socialist administrative apparatus. Here too cadre policy will be a great help. The selection and placement of people should be done

openly, on a competitive basis. Principledness, comradeliness, and responsibility among those elected and those electing should become the norm. If Communists go stale in responsible posts and yield to formalism, they must be removed and any attempts to allow them to simply change jobs should be stopped. And it is just as necessary to check on how decisions and the party's policy directives are carried out: This is a paramount question in the struggle against bureaucracy.

The party's tasks in ethnic relations are complex but noble. Party organizations and Communists from all ethnic groups are called upon to be the soul of the socialist alliance of the peoples and its cementing force.

The party has put forward the idea of glasnost—it must assert and develop this idea. It must set an example of initiative in disseminating glasnost—that is predetermined by the open nature of its policy. The party is today strengthening its ties with society by means of providing the population with extensive information, holding free discussions of questions of party life and party leadership, and ensuring the openness of party forums and meetings. This process will be deepened still further, and therefore the conference stressed that it is party organizations' duty to foster glasnost and the ability to conduct democratic polemics and comradely discussions.

A single-party system has historically emerged in our country. Life itself and the multifaceted experience of society, the country, and the people have reaffirmed the CPSU's right to be the spiritual mentor of society and the political leader of millions. The 19th all-union party conference has again shown that a Leninist ferment, a Leninist lack of complacency, and a Leninist firmness and resolve are alive and well in the party. The party has everything for success: experience, energy, and powerful levers of contact with the masses, including the mass media. The party has boldly and irrevocably turned toward restructuring and renewal: The overwhelming majority of Communists have taken to heart the call to build all the party's life in accordance with the conference resolutions without waiting for a congress to include all this in the statutes.

Renewed and purified, the party will lead the people to the ultimate goals of restructuring. There is such a party!

PRAVDA Editorial Views Resolution on Ethnic Relations

*PM1207151 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jul 88
Second Edition p 1*

[Editorial under the rubric "All-Union Party Conference Resolution": "The USSR Is Our Common Home"]

[Text] Russians and Chuvashes, Ukrainians and Nivkhi, Belorussians and Tatars, Armenians and Gagauz, Estonians and Yakut.... More than 100 nations and nationalities live and work side by side in the USSR. The commonality of their historic destiny is the basis for

international socialist fraternity. It was pointed out at the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference that life has convincingly confirmed the correctness of V.I. Lenin's idea—combining and pooling efforts has enabled every nation and society as a whole to sharply accelerate its movement. History, perhaps, has never seen such a rapid rise from a state of backwardness to the might of a modern great power.

But let us ask ourselves the following question: Is everything okay in our country, is everything going well? Yes, the national question as bequeathed us by the exploitative system has been resolved successfully, definitively, and irrevocably. But it is extremely important to see the whole real picture: both the undoubted achievements and also the obvious imperfections, omissions, and difficulties. The reality is as follows: The dynamism inherent in the initial phase of forming the multinational state of the Soviets was essentially wasted and undermined by the deviation from Leninist principles of the nationalities policy, by violations of legality during the period of the personality cult, and by the ideology and psychology of stagnation. This was the conclusion drawn by the Resolution "On Interethnic Relations" adopted by the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference. In many respects the resolution of the nationalities question in our country was absolutized and the notion that there were no problems in national relations gained a firm foothold. At times the requirements for the socioeconomic and cultural development of both individual republics and autonomous formations and also national groups were neglected. Some questions of vital importance were for a long time left unresolved.

Restructuring, democratization, and glasnost have highlighted a number of questions to which little attention was paid previously. They included, for instance, questions of language, development of national culture and art, ecology, and protection of monuments. Everyone is aware that instances of national egoism, arrogance, free-loading sentiments, and parochialism still occur. Some people try to cause clashes between people of different nationalities and try to spread dissension between them. We have seen for ourselves from the example of Nagorno-Karabakh what tangles can result from problems of interethnic relations.

The All-Union CPSU Conference posed as a task of historic importance that of persistently asserting and creatively developing the Leninist norms and principles of the nationalities policy and resolutely cleansing them of artificial accretions and deformations. The main thing is to see problems that constantly crop up and to seek out and provide timely answers to questions put forward by life. The course of the 27th CPSU Congress must be persistently implemented, a course that combines satisfying the interests of all nations and ethnic groups with the country's common interests and requirements. The CPSU sees the development of the republics' and autonomous areas' independence as indissolubly linked with

their responsibility for strengthening our multinational state and ensuring its progress. Internationalist ideology is incompatible with any varieties of chauvinism and nationalism.

The party conference outlined a range of measures to further develop and strengthen the Soviet federation on the basis of democratic principles. The rights of the union republics and autonomous formations are being broadened and conditions are being created for their greater independence and responsibility in the sphere of the economy, social and cultural development, and nature protection. Radical economic reform and the process of democratization are opening up broad scope for the optimum combination of the interests of both national-state formations and also the country as a whole.

Delegates' speeches mentioned the transfer of certain republics and regions to the principles of economic accountability [khozraschet], while clearly defining their contribution to the resolution of all-union programs. The resolution points out that the idea deserves attention. Here it is important to formulate the matter in such a way that people are well aware of how much a republic or oblast produces, its contribution to the country's economy, and how much it receives. A qualitatively new mechanism for forming republic and local budgets must be worked out legislatively and their role in resolving questions of regions' socioeconomic development boosted. Effective collaboration between territorial management organs and central ministries and departments must be ensured and the responsibility of both republic and also union management organs for republic and oblast comprehensive development stepped up.

The internationalization of the economy and the whole of public life is a logical process. But the desire for national exclusivity can only lead to economic and spiritual impoverishment. The conference outlined steps to galvanize those institutions in the political system which must be used to coordinate national interests.

In this connection boosting the role of the soviets, above all that of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities, its standing commissions, and also the USSR Government is of paramount importance. The conference deemed it advisable to create where necessary in the USSR Supreme Soviet, union and autonomous republic supreme soviets, and local soviets permanent commissions on questions of interethnic relations and advocated the formation of a special state body for affairs of nationalities and national relations. In light of the new realities it has been recommended that legislation on union republics and autonomous areas be updated and that it more fully reflect their rights and obligations and the principles of self-management and of representation for all nationalities in organs of power both at the center and at local level.

One clause in the Resolution "On Interethnic Relations" is geared to ensuring that economic and social progress is accompanied by spiritual progress with the emphasis on the cultural uniqueness of the nations and ethnic groups. It stresses that the free development and full and equal use by all citizens of the USSR of their mother tongues and the mastery of the Russian language, which has been voluntarily adopted by Soviet people as a means of interethnic communication, are the most important principle in our multiethnic state. All conditions must be created for national-Russian bilingualism to develop not merely pro forma but harmoniously and naturally and for the study of the native language by other nationalities inhabiting a particular republic to be encouraged.

Young people are the country's future. How we educate them determines how they will turn out. Each generation accumulates social experience in its own way and goes through the school of patriotism and internationalism. It is important to reveal the sources of the friendship among our people starting with the family and school and for interethnic relations to be actively cultivated.

Shaping a socialist internationalist way of life is a matter for the entire party and for all Soviet people. Political experience, labor ethics, and the moral potential of the working class, the peasantry, and the intelligentsia must be mobilized for this. The Komsomol and army service are called upon to do a great deal in this field.

It is a Soviet person's civic duty to actively combat national insularity, conceit, and chauvinism. Any national problems demand a well-considered approach. They must be resolved calmly and extremely responsibly within the framework of socialist democracy and legality, primarily by means of meeting each other halfway. The ultimate concern is to create the kind of social atmosphere whereby a person of any nationality can feel at home in any part of the country. The resolution stresses that the social and historic importance of the nationwide holiday—USSR Formation Day—must be boosted.

Communists of all nationalities are the soul of the socialist union of the peoples, its cohesive force. Through their entire activity, party organizations are called upon to rally working people under the flag of restructuring and mobilize people to fulfill the resolutions adopted by the conference. It is necessary to firmly hold course to ensure that all nations and ethnic groups are represented in party, soviet, Komsomol, and economic organs and that the composition of leading cadres reflects most fully the national structure of Soviet society.

The conference supported the CPSU Central Committee Politburo proposal on holding a party Central Committee plenum on questions of national relations.

The USSR is our common home. We are its masters. That is why we must equip it, care for it, and bolster everything that serves to rally the peoples of the USSR.

IZVESTIYA Editorial Views Expanding Democratic Process

*PM0012071 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Jul 88
Morning Edition p 1*

[Editorial: "The 19th Party Conference on Expanding Democracy"]

[Text] Such a thing had not happened for a long time. At least, not in the memory of even middle-aged people. The days pass since the conference closed, but the discussions about it continue. Indeed, it seems that discussions are burgeoning every which way. And these are not the "compulsory" discussions which were sluggishly held in previous years after the latest "historic forum." People are arguing and talking themselves. The discussions center on the forthcoming reform of the political system. And the reform centers on the democratization of all aspects of society's life.

For decades old and young alike have been taught methodically and without any particular proof that ours is the "most democratic system in the world." Yet meanwhile the people were increasingly being removed from the levers of administration, from the shaping of organs of power, and from the democratic—that is, with their participation—resolution of vitally important issues. Virtually everything was decided on their behalf. Starting with when to plow, and ending with whom to vote for. The proprietors of the country were merely allowed to submissively consent to all this.

To state that all this will quickly disappear from our life today would be to considerably embellish reality. The stagnant past, from which the party's healthy forces are resolutely dissociating themselves, is still belligerent and tenacious. Not for nothing did the conference admit quite bluntly that although "the country's slide into economic and sociopolitical crisis has been halted," the "processes of restructuring are proceeding in a contradictory, complex, and difficult fashion in a confrontation between old and new." Why? There is an honest answer to this question: By no means everyone as yet accepts democratic methods of work and life. "At all levels of social, state, and economic activity," one of the resolutions notes, "there are still many workers who are unwilling or unable to give up methods of administration by edict and who find innovations painful. There are also many who are scared by the scale and depth of restructuring and would prefer to stop halfway and restrict the revolutionary content of restructuring to half-measures."

Nonetheless, it can now definitely be stated that the ideological, political, and social atmosphere in the country has changed markedly. And the main thing that has helped this is democratization. The development and

deepening of democratic processes and the assertion of glasnost—which is indissolubly bound up with them—sharply raised the political and social activeness not only of Communists but of nonparty people even before the party conference and enhanced their interest in what the delegates were to discuss and decide. The conference has given the democratization process such powerful impetus that now, in its wake, it is quite frankly difficult to measure life by yesterday's yardsticks. The course of the conference itself showed that democracy in relations is becoming not just a word but a fact. For instance, the fact that for the first time in recent years the number of people wanting to speak did not diminish with each passing day but, on the contrary, increased, attests to the newly emerged and, for many, still unusual atmosphere of attention to other opinions—without which there is no democracy and can be none. Finally, the decisions that were adopted. Soberly and very severely stating the situation in which the party and society find themselves, they at the same time unambiguously reinforce what has been achieved during the period of restructuring. Including the progress of the country's democratization.

However, in its resolutions the conference did not restrict itself to supporting and defending the shoots of democracy that have already taken root. It posed the task of moving strongly and sharply down this road. Clear-cut and resolute measures have been taken to this end. Thanks to these measures the democratization process should encompass in a very short time absolutely all spheres of our life—the economy, state building, public and social relations, and the party itself. The latter is of fundamental importance. Remaining the leading political force in Soviet society, the party is concerned to ensure that reform results in the creation of a democratic mechanism of functioning that would rule out the possibility of the usurpation of power or the influence of subjective or incidental circumstances on party policy. "The CPSU," the 19th all-union conference assured us, "will never allow any repetition of anything such as was associated with the periods of the personality cult and stagnation—periods that caused profound deformations in socialist society, held back its development for whole decades, and led to huge human casualties and innumerable moral and ideological losses." That is, it will not permit anything that could only appear in an atmosphere of antidemocracy and disdain for the will and reason of millions.

The measures outlined by the conference for democratizing the entire state system and social structures create the prerequisites for profound and comprehensive changes. As a result of these measures broad scope should be opened up for socialist society's self-management, conditions created for fully developing citizens' initiative, and a mechanism coordinated for democratically revealing and shaping the interests and will of all classes and social groups. In other words, all affairs in the country should be resolved by the people and their competent representatives and be under their complete and effective control.

It should be said that wherever methods of democratic self-management are making headway we can today see a new attitude on the part of people both to their work and to the resolution of social problems. Take the economy. The conference aired many sharp judgments about ministerial and departmental monopolies that strive to distort the essence of the Law on the State Enterprise and crush the initiative and independence of labor collectives. Shackled by the diktat of so-called state orders and deprived of any room for economic maneuver, many state enterprises are finding it hard to clamber out of the mire of stagnation.

The picture is quite different in the strengthening cooperative movement. Lack of economic constraint, quick reactions to consumer needs, self-management, and economic accountability [khozraschet] all constitute the assertion of democracy in the economy. That is why the struggle against bureaucratic distortions of the Law on the State Enterprise, the prompting of labor collective councils to engage in vigorous activity, and the development of economically accountable, contract, and lease relations both in industry and in agriculture is what we must struggle for today with might and main if we want to secure a victory for democratic principles in the economy.

The deepening of democracy in all spheres of life is a meaningful and broad concept. It means the democratization of management with a redistribution of functions and powers to local areas. It means a simplification of the structure and an improvement of the work methods of the state apparatus, whose activity should be under the constant control of the people—which may to a considerable extent promote the successful struggle against bureaucratism. It also means the expansion of the political rights and personal freedoms of citizens, among which a special place goes to the human right to participate in administration and in expressing one's own opinion on any question, and to freedom of conscience.

Finally, and perhaps above all, the soviets must be a reliable guarantee of the deepening of democratic relations in society.

The conference framed the question thus: Not a single question of state, economic, or social life should be decided separately from soviets elected on a democratic basis.

In this regard it is necessary to particularly mention one of the most important aspects of people's power: the electoral system. The conference stressed that the current electoral system needs to be substantially altered. And that is indeed so. Organs of power will only become genuinely popular if the people themselves start electing their representatives to soviets—be they city, rayon, or supreme soviets—rather than agreeing to a single candidate proposed “from above.” Literally the other day IZVESTIYA published a letter from worker V. Kuzemko

in which he recounted why he refused to vote for the sole candidate proposed to voters as a deputy to the USSR Supreme Soviet. He refused because nobody had fought for V. Kuzemko's vote. Everyone was sure (and so it turned out, incidentally!) that the candidate approved in some office would definitely become a deputy.

But the democratization of the country's political and social life, which the conference advocated, now presupposes an entirely different responsibility for our votes, actions, and decisions. Everyone must learn democracy. Both those who are elected and those doing the electing.

This science is not simple. That is why today we must support every new shoot of democracy and every manifestation of genuine socialist self-management. By supporting democratization, we are thereby supporting the decisions of the 19th party conference geared to fundamentally changing Soviet society.

PRAVDA Carries Editorial on Glasnost Resolution

*PM1207100 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Jul 88
Second Edition p 1*

[Editorial under the rubric “Resolutions of the 19th All-Union Party Conference”: “Without Glasnost There Is No Restructuring, No Democracy”]

[Text] On the eve of the conference this idea was like a refrain in the editors' mail: We expect lessons in glasnost and truth from the conference. We believe that those expectations have been justified—glasnost was one of the heroines of the conference. The actual debate there, which we followed with great interest, reflected the atmosphere of openness, honesty, and sincerity which is becoming established in society.

As is known, the conference adopted, inter alia, the resolution “On Glasnost.” Whoever has read it attentively cannot fail to have noticed these words: “The inclusion of glasnost in public life.” Inclusion.... This means that we did not have it, and we did not know what it is like to live under conditions of glasnost. But without it—without glasnost—people were afraid to speak the truth aloud, for everything that was later referred to as stagnation phenomena was sheltered behind the name of the party and the people, and just try to tell the truth if it undermined the “authorities” and spotlighted sham heroes, swindlers with ministerial rank, liars, and toadies.

Glasnost is the sharp weapon of restructuring, and the fact that some people still fear it confirms once again how essential it is. Our readers call glasnost a means of getting rid of various kinds of deformations, a means of healing chronic illnesses. They ponder on how it should be in the future and on guarantees of the irreversibility of the changes that have begun. Here are some lines from letters. “The overwhelming majority of Communists still lack the chief thing—free access to information, which is

still under the control of the leadership." "The further from Moscow, the more the level of glasnost changes, and not for the better." "What are we afraid of? Trial by glasnost? There is no need to be! We must do more to ensure that glasnost always and in everything acts only in its own person—glasnost—without provincial makeup and tinsel garlands."

There is no need to go over the resolution "On Glasnost" again in detail—it can be seen by everyone and is accessible to everyone. We would like to single out what are, in our view, the chief aspects.

For the first time since V.I. Lenin, a party conference provides a detailed concept of glasnost in a socialist society and speaks of its role and purpose and the real need for it in all spheres of our life. The conference considers the further development of glasnost one of the most important political tasks. We emphasize—political, for it is a question of the interests of socialism and restructuring, a question of the country's destiny.

The reader has a right to ask the question: "I am for glasnost, but what bearing do I have on political tasks? For are they not determined by the leadership?" Let us not be in a hurry to apply the epithet "naive" here. Each of us looks at his own purpose through the prism of his own work and occupations, through contact with living practice, when you either feel that people need you or you do not. After the many years that you were considered just a cog, the ordinary person has lost a taste for shaping policy. This is why the conference regards glasnost and its broadening as an indispensable condition for introducing the individual to all the affairs of society, the state, and the collective. Through this introduction we participate in politics, through this introduction we shape it. And we not only shape it. Glasnost is also a guarantee against deformations of socialism, since it creates a basis of nationwide control over the work of social institutions, organs of power, and the state.

Today we are learning to live under conditions of glasnost. We can boldly state that it is our common asset. We have welcomed it in our home with an open heart and at once taken to it. We like living under conditions when fear of speaking the truth is being replaced by the civic desire to express a personal opinion on any issue; we like the fact that socialist pluralism of opinions is becoming the norm, while heated arguments and debates are opening up the way to truth. But glasnost today, however much we like it, itself needs both deepening and support, for it is a developing process.

Why does it need namely support?

The point is that a considerable amount of information remains inaccessible to the general public and is not used for the purpose of restructuring or enhancing the political culture of the masses and management cadres. Reports of glasnost being held back frequently come from the provinces. Barriers, including parochial and

departmental ones, are being erected in its path. There is no reduction in the number of letters—to PRAVDA as well—containing working people's complaints. What about victimization and even reprisals for criticism? Have we really gotten rid of this? Glasnost needs protection against ambitions, when personal or group interests are pushed through under its flag and when comradely exactingness and the concepts of honor and duty are pushed aside in favor of such interests. We must proceed from an honest understanding of the inalienable principle of glasnost—freedom to express opinions today serves the cause of ennobling the individual and protecting his dignity, not of humiliating the individual by means of calumnies and insulting tags.

In developing glasnost, the resolution states, the party is invariably guided by Lenin's instruction that the masses must know everything, judge everything, and undertake everything consciously. The Communist Party and the Soviet people need the truth and full, objective information about everything happening in society. Glasnost must serve the goals of consolidating all social forces around the ideas and principles of restructuring.

We believe that the resolution's thesis that namely the party takes on the urgent task of helping, for its part, to assert and develop the basic principles of glasnost has been perceived with profound satisfaction. What kind of principles are they? The inalienable right of every citizen to receive on any question of public life full and authentic information which does not constitute a state or military secret; the right to open and free discussion of any question of public significance.

The conference pointed out that the party must set an example of initiative in developing glasnost. This thought was aired in working people's letters, in the debates during the preparations for the conference, and in the discussion of the CPSU Central Committee Theses. It was reflected in the resolution.

In order to set an example, every party worker must reinterpret a great deal. He must assimilate a great deal—not just knowledge but also the lessons of life. But the chief thing is to realize that without glasnost there is no restructuring, no democracy. That glasnost is the natural atmosphere of life and progress under democratic, humane socialism. Natural! Whether or not people like glasnost, there is and will be no return to the old ways. Therefore it was strange to hear on the eve of the conference the statements by individual party workers that the press is allegedly always shaking and undermining their authority and that there will be an end to journalists' liberties after the conference. To a certain extent this attitude toward the party press was also seen in some delegates. You might think that it is party workers that should understand better than others the role of the party organ in developing glasnost and rely on it, but the facts attest differently: In some places, manifest hostility toward journalists creeps in.

The conference noted the important role of the mass media in broadening glasnost. Of course, far from everything has been done, and there is something to criticize the press for too. Journalists were asked to enhance their responsibility for the printed word. The times when the printed word became the obedient tool of authoritarianism and bureaucratic arbitrariness are still fresh in our memory. Today the press too must restructure itself and learn the culture of criticism, the culture of comradely debate. This is not an abandonment of criticism. It is inadmissible to hold back critical articles. But it is also inadmissible to publish unobjective information which offends the citizen's honor and dignity. The press must reflect without distortion the viewpoints of sides in dispute. No one has a monopoly on the truth, and there must be no monopoly on glasnost either.

The soil of openness and glasnost is a fertile one for the press. But weeds too can appear in good soil. Everyone must endeavor to prevent factionalism and manifestations of demagoguery and national, regional, or corporative egotism.

The inclusion of glasnost in public life since the CPSU Central Committee April Plenum has fully justified itself. But glasnost does not mean carte blanche or the principle "I will get what I want." And it is no coincidence that the resolution states that it is inadmissible to use glasnost to the detriment of the interests of the state, society, or the rights of the individual, to preach war, violence, racism, or national and religious intolerance, to propagandize cruelty and disseminate pornography, as well as to manipulate glasnost.

Today the word "glasnost" is widely known throughout the world. At one time people attempted to translate it, but then it came to be used in newspapers without being translated—glasnost. It is certainly not linguists but politicians who study what lies behind this word. For us, in the international arena glasnost is promoting the cause of peace and cooperation and helping to strengthen the ideas of a nuclear-free and nonviolent world.

Glasnost, criticism, and self-criticism serve the people's interests. They reflect the openness of our society's political system. They attest to its strength, political vitality, and moral health.

PRAVDA Editorial Considers Resolution on Legal Reform

*PM1407141 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Jul 88
Second Edition p 1*

[Editorial under the rubric "All-Union Party Conference Resolutions": "The Law Is the Same for Everyone"]

[Text] We have been mechanically repeating this phrase for many years without noticing that frequently it did not correspond to reality. During the years of the personality cult and the phenomena of stagnation, distortions and deformations appeared in the legal system.

They were a consequence of authoritarian methods of management which are alien to socialism and of a departure from the Leninist principles of state life. In the upper echelons of the economic, party, and soviet apparatus there formed what could almost be described as a caste of untouchables which was beyond the reach of all control, including legal control. This gradually led to the emergence of organized crime, corruption, bribe taking, and other negative phenomena. At the same time instances of criminal proceedings being instituted against innocent people multiplied.

The CPSU Central Committee 1985 April Plenum and the 27th CPSU Congress clearly exposed the conservatism and the shortcomings of the existing legal system which was frequently guided by command and administrative methods of leadership with their numerous prohibitions and petty regimentation rather than democratic or economic methods. Legislation too was lagging behind life. For this reason a number of existing legal acts acted as a brake rather than a lever of restructuring. The need for a legal reform which would embrace a wide range of legal standards relating primarily to socialist ownership, planning, economic, labor, taxation, pension, and other relations became apparent. It was also necessary to continue the work to strengthen the legitimate rights, interests, and freedoms of individual citizens.

During the years of restructuring quite a lot has already been done in this area. Law enforcement organs are no longer a closed zone for glasnost, their activities are increasingly subordinated to the spirit of democratization. However, as the 19th all-union party conference resolution "On Legal Reform" noted, the measures that have been adopted can only be rated as the beginning of a major effort connected with the formation of a law-based socialist state.

This task has been set by the party for the first time. Resolving it means creating constitutional guarantees for the irreversibility of restructuring, firmly establishing in our society the supremacy and triumph of the rule of law as an expression of the will of the people, strengthening the protection of human rights and freedoms, and placing the actions of state and party organs, public organizations, labor collectives, and all officials and citizens on a strictly legal footing.

The law-based socialist state is a very broad and meaningful concept. It is not confined to a certain level of legality. Ultimately only a state which is characterized by reciprocal responsibility on the part of the state and its citizens, their associations and organizations, and all those who enter with the state into mutual relations regulated by law can be described as a law-based state.

People who followed the proceedings of the conference closely will have noticed that these thoughts were expressed in the speeches of many delegates. And that is quite natural. After all, all our initiatives and all the

decisions adopted by the conference will come to fruition only if they are implemented on a strictly legal basis. Observance of the rule of law is not a shortlived campaign. It is a way of life. And it is this way of life which is to be firmly established by the legal reform whose implementation was outlined by the party conference. The reform is called upon to ensure the rule of law in all the spheres of society's life and to strengthen the mechanism of the maintenance of socialist law and order on the basis of the development of people's power.

So what is to be done to create a genuinely law-based state?

Above all, it is necessary to improve the legislative activity of the supreme organs of power. Unfortunately, frankly speaking, this work was carried out for many years behind doors which were closed to most people. Draft laws were compiled by the apparatus and frequently expressed the will of departments and special-interest groups rather than the people. Therefore it is particularly important to democratize the legislative process, as the party conference noted. This process is to be based on glasnost, competent scientific evaluation, and the discussion of draft laws with the involvement of the broad public, that is, all the people. Only in this way can a consolidation of the constitutional regime and an enhancement of the role and effectiveness of Soviet laws regulating key areas of social relations be achieved. Only with the participation of every citizen can the consistent implementation be ensured of the principle which rang out at the conference: Everything that is not banned by law, is allowed.

The operative word in this formula is "law." It is absolutely necessary that in this context "law" is understood in the strictly constitutional sense of this word, that is exclusively as a legal document adopted by a supreme organ of state power. If, as often happens in day-to-day life, law is taken to mean any official rule or regulation, then the cited formula is likely to lose its real meaning as a result of the plethora of bans which characterizes departmental and local rule and regulation promulgation. This formula is addressed to citizens and their associations. As for organs of management and officials, they have their sphere of competence which they are not allowed to exceed.

Unfortunately, this rule is still being frequently broken today. Numerous departmental instructions frequently run counter to the law and the Constitution, hamper the development of the national economy and the initiative of the working people, and infringe upon their rights and interests. Therefore a cardinal review, codification, and systematization of legislation must become an inalienable part of the legal reform. In light of the new conditions of economic management, the humanization and democratization of social life, and work to prevent violations of the law, it is necessary to introduce substantial changes in all the spheres of legislation, and in

particular to radically review the criminal, administrative, procedural, and corrective-labor legislation. In order to ensure strict compliance of laws and government resolutions with the stipulations of the USSR Constitution, the conference has deemed it advisable to set up a committee for constitutional supervision and also to step up all work in monitoring departmental edicts to ensure that the stipulations of the law are strictly observed in them. The number of these edicts is also to be sharply reduced.

Of great importance in the creation of the law-based state is the enhancement of the role of courts within the system of socialist democracy. It is necessary to further develop glasnost and the adversary system in Soviet court procedure and to strictly observe the principle of the presumption of innocence. It is impermissible for innocent people to be punished, but likewise, a conniving attitude toward people who have infringed the law cannot be tolerated.

The conference resolution "On Legal Reform" emphasizes the need to strengthen the independence of law enforcement organ officials. In the case of judges, for instance, a guarantee of this will be provided through the election of rayon, city, okrug, oblast, and kray court judges by superior soviets of people's deputies and also the establishment of an extended term of office of these judges.

However, not only citizens' legitimate rights and interests need to be protected. In the conditions of the economic reform, economic accountability, self-management, and self-financing many legal problems are arising also for industrial and agricultural enterprises and cooperatives. This was noted by many delegates at the conference. In response to the concern which they expressed the resolution speaks of the need to extend the powers of the State Board of Arbitration as regards strengthening contractual discipline, protecting the rights of enterprises and cooperatives, and boosting the legal services in soviets of people's deputies, ministries and departments, and economic organizations.

The work of prosecutor's office organs has attracted much criticism in recent years. A considerable bias toward investigative work to the detriment of supervisory functions has taken shape here. The conference therefore noted the need to restore the Leninist principles of supervision by the prosecutor's office. It is called upon to strictly monitor the implementation and uniform interpretation and application of laws and to persistently combat violations of socialist legality, irrespective of their origin.

The legal reform makes provision for improving the work of the militia. Rudeness and incompetence on the part of militia members are less frequent than they were, but they do occur. Enhancing the standards of work and professional competence of internal affairs organs' staff

is the task of the day. The resolution also makes provision for measures to make better use of the militia's potential in combating crime. Specifically, it is envisaged to concentrate the investigation of the bulk of criminal cases in the Ministry of Internal Affairs investigation apparatus. In order to protect it against being influenced by the preliminary investigation organs it is deemed advisable to establish investigation as a separate structure not subordinate to republic or local internal affairs organs.

The party conference resolution also pays attention to enhancing the role of defense attorneys as a self-managing association for the provision of legal aid to citizens and organizations. It is envisaged to increase the participation of defense attorneys in preliminary investigation and court procedure. This measure will help to increase the effectiveness of the defense of the citizens rights, interests, and freedoms.

Naturally, implementing a legal reform is a difficult task which cannot be accomplished overnight. The question of the professional training of those who will carry out the reform and work in the law enforcement organs is of paramount importance here. Unfortunately, there are quite a few gaps in the training for the legal profession. What is needed is a proper system of selection, education, training, and further training of people whose job it is to safeguard the law. With the same aim, the conference documents state, it is necessary to reorganize the training of scientific and teaching cadres, eliminate their detachment from practice, and enhance their competence. The establishment of the law-based socialist state and the reforms connected with this call for a restructuring of the legal thinking and legal education of the entire population. It is necessary to organize basic legal education as a single statewide and partywide program which would embrace all the sections of the working people and all cadres at the center and at local level.

The all-union party conference has outlined the program for a legal reform. It is now a question of elaborating and carrying into effect, with the participation of public and scientific organizations, a specific plan of action for its implementation within the very near future. We must make sure that we live in a genuinely law-based socialist state.

IZVESTIYA Editorial Examines Interethnic Ties
PM1307092 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Jul 88
Morning Edition p 1

[Editorial: "The 19th Party Conference on Interethnic Relations"]

[Text] One of the most impressive and incontestable gains of socialism is its ability to resolve fairly the problems of interethnic relations. The unique alliance between peoples united by their great goal is a matter of

pride for Soviet people. This alliance became possible owing to Lenin's policy and Lenin's principles, which are consistently embodied by the Soviet people and the Communist Party.

The 19th party conference resolution pointed out that this alliance stands for the international unity of working people of all nations and nationalities within the USSR, the right of nations to self-determination, the revival and development of their national cultures, the acceleration of the progress of previously backward national regions, and the elimination of interethnic dissension. An integral economic complex—the material foundation for the unity of the USSR's peoples—has taken shape. The economic, cultural, and cadre potential of all republics and autonomous areas has increased immeasurably. A new historic community—the Soviet people—has become a reality. National consciousness is naturally increasing.

But there is also another element: The dynamism inherent in the initial phase of the formation of the interethnic Land of the Soviets was effectively lost and undermined by deviation from Leninist principles with regard to nationalities policy, by infringements of the law during the period of the personality cult, and by the ideology and psychology of stagnation. Contradictions which arose in this sphere were either "tactically" hushed up or were muffled amid solemn speeches and scientific works which were more reminiscent of dinner toasts to friendship.

Three years—just 3—of broadening democracy and glasnost have opened practically everyone's eyes to the achievements and omissions of the past years and it has become clear that the most complex sphere of interethnic relations needs, perhaps, more persistent restructuring than all the other spheres. For all problems—economic, social, and spiritual—are exacerbated and become much more sensitive when transferred to the plane of national grievances and aspirations. Socialism has every opportunity to prevent such an exacerbation and to resolve it in the interests of all the peoples if conflict does nonetheless materialize. But apparently we all came to believe in the automatism and universality of the resources and methods in our arsenal. That was why the nationalities question in our country was deemed resolved once and for all.

Recent events, events around Karabakh, which have troubled and alarmed many people, prompted other thoughts. These questions have been engendered not by restructuring, as some people think, but have been revealed by it and placed on the agenda. Thus, we must seek ways of resolving them. All this illustrates the complexity of the situation. Complexity which has not been hidden this time from the party and the people but put forward in the CPSU Central Committee Theses published on the eve of the conference for universal consultation and analysis.

Delegates' speeches at the conference, their depth, and their very tone, which was conducive to debate and reflection, were an extension of this sober and principled process of analysis. For instance, people said from the rostrum at the party forum that it is very important in the course of restructuring to shape new incentives and aims to rally the Soviet peoples politically. The creation of a multinational legal state must start with true equality for nations enshrined in the USSR Constitution. It is important for this right to have priority. But there is an even more urgent need for a mechanism to guarantee the steadfast implementation of the Constitution's provisions.

Thoughts consonant with speeches made from the conference rostrum have recently been expressed in readers' letters to the IZVESTIYA editorial office. A. Bakhshiyev, a teacher of political economy and veteran of the Great Patriotic War from Baku, writes: "Many universally esteemed writers and academics are arguing heatedly and uncompromisingly over what such and such a village was called previously because its name is now different, and so on.

"These are also necessary matters. But the main thing now is to combat the three enemies known as bribery, bureaucracy, and lack of culture—our common enemies." True! But alongside such sober voices both in life and in the mailbag there is unfortunately, at present, an abundance of quick-tempered words that smack of ultimatums such as "forbid," "unmask," and "don't allow." That is, voices of yesteryear when commands and menacing growls would often prevail over the desire to understand one's opponent, be it a person of a different nationality or even a whole people, or would prevail over the endeavor to jointly seek ways of reaching a compromise.

In the course of restructuring, B. Pugo, first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, rightly pointed out that not only individuals but also whole nations have begun to display greater social and political activeness and a healthy dissatisfaction with what has been achieved. This is a normal phenomenon.

But at the same time it has come to light that some people who have incorrectly understood the principles of social justice are trying to demand a larger slice of the social pie for themselves, although it would be far more correct for everyone to put in more work and make this pie a little larger.

Today it is clear that the peoples of our multinational country have not only a common historical destiny and common aims but also a common material base created by joint labor and a unified economic complex, all of whose components, including Yakut diamonds, Ukrainian grain, Sverdlovsk excavators, and Uzbek cotton, are interdependent. Everything is interdependent just as in a single mighty organism. But the departmental approach and diktat by a number of ministries has also managed to

violate the proportions here and has transformed Uzbekistan into an all but single-crop republic and Komi into a great "reformatory." Can the harmonious development of all be conditional upon such one-sided development by any one of the members of the alliance? Clearly this is intolerable today.

Some prospects for new fairer relations between the regions and the center and also between republics are envisaged in the conference resolution, which says, in particular: "Radical economic reform and the process of democratization provide broad scope to combine in the optimum fashion the interests of both national-state formations and also the country as a whole. The matter must be formulated in such a way as to ensure that working people are well aware of how much the republic or oblast produces, what it contributes to the country's economy, and how much it receives."

It is quite understandable that such economic accountability [khozraschet] must not only make each region richer but also reinforce the country's historically established unified national economic complex since each republic's economy depends on the state of this complex. There must be absolutely no place in this concept for regional egoism.

It is also clear that restructuring in the sphere of national relations will proceed simultaneously with the reform of the political structure. First of all, the institutions in the political system which will help to uncover and coordinate national interests must be mobilized. The role of the soviets, above all the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities, its permanent commissions, and the USSR Government will be substantially increased here. The conference also recommended the creation of permanent commissions on questions of interethnic relations in the USSR Supreme Soviet, in union and autonomous republic supreme soviets, and, where necessary, in local soviets.

The new state which must be imparted to interethnic relations requires—and the resolution also mentioned this—profound legal study and new standards in developing a multinational socialist culture, which is called upon to be a powerful factor for the ideological and moral consolidation of society and for fostering—along with a sense of pride for one's people and for one's "local" homeland—a great sense of the fraternity of all the peoples and a sense of Soviet patriotism.

The unique multinational nature of our country should not alienate people of different nationalities but, on the contrary, serve to mutually enrich them and augment the forces of restructuring.

The conference expressed confidence that our common present and future lies in consolidating and uniting all Soviet peoples. Let everyone who values the fate of the country take to heart and bear in mind the good sense of the decision adopted by the party forum: "It is the

patriotic and international duty of every citizen and every Communist to protect and multiply everything that serves to rally Soviet society as the basis for the free development and prosperity of all the peoples of the USSR and everything that serves to strengthen the might of our common fatherland."

These general guidelines and principles laid down by the conference are not the end but the start of the great, difficult, but noble work of setting our house to rights, work which must be developed and enriched with the labor of our hearts and minds and all the best of our common experience.

IZVESTIYA Editorial Considers New Role of Soviets

PM1307141 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Jul 88 Morning Edition p 1

[Editorial: "The 19th Party Conference on the New Role of Soviets"]

[Text] It is 10 days since the conclusion of the party conference. But the country is still feeling the effect of its ideas, the tense sharpness of its debates, and its open and democratic atmosphere of glasnost, to which our society still finds it difficult to accustom itself after so many years of silence [bezglasiye]. Overflowing beyond the confines of the Kremlin Palace of Congresses, the conference now seems to be continuing in every party organization, in every labor collective, in every family. Time imparts growing depth and specificity to these discussions and arguments, focusing people's attention on the main and key problems of the development of restructuring which were singled out and emphasized in the conference resolutions.

Among all these problems, the guaranteeing of the full power of soviets as the basis of socialist statehood and self-management in our country was described in the resolutions as the decisive avenue in the reform of the political system. In practical terms this means that not a single state, economic, or social question should or can be resolved bypassing the soviets, that the party's entire policy—economic, social, or nationalities policy—must be implemented primarily through the soviets of people's deputies as organs of people's power.

Why was this question raised so acutely and in such principled fashion at the party conference?

An analysis of the course of restructuring and the current state of the economy inevitably leads to the conclusion that the braking mechanism cannot be overcome and dismantled without decisive and radical changes in the management of all spheres of life and society's activity and that, unless this is done, success is altogether impossible. "The key problems of restructuring—the economic reform, the development of the social and cultural sphere, and the cultivation in people of a keen proprietorial attitude toward everything that is happening in the

country," it was said in the report to the conference—"are now really coming up against the ossified system of power and its command-pressure structure."

This burdensome legacy built up over the decades. The disregard for Lenin's principles of people's power and self-management, of Lenin's perception of the soviets' role, resulted in grave deformation of the political system created by October and predetermined the conditions for the emergence of the personality cult and the concentration of economic management functions in the hands of the party-political leadership and its apparatus, whose power and importance became excessively hypertrophied. This inevitably led to arbitrariness and illegality, had a baneful effect on our society's development, and doomed to failure the attempts at economic reforms and social transformations.

The apparatus practice of work which developed in party committees and ispolkoms turned upside down the mutual relations within party organizations and within organs of Soviet power. Nowadays any ispolkom official, without himself being a deputy, feels that he is entitled to issue direct instructions to those elected by the people and even to demand of deputies that they account for their actions. It was no accident that the party conference noted that people's awareness is still being influenced by the simplified and truncated model of socialist people's power which is identified not with political activity by working people but with executive organs.

Another bad tradition which has developed is that every now and again soviets, in their daily activity, find themselves powerless before departmental diktat or the mighty apparatus of ministries which do not even bother to notify local authorities of any actions they may have taken in their territory. Recently this has repeatedly resulted in ecological conflicts and spontaneous rallies and demonstrations in defense of historical and cultural monuments and so on. Even local party organs are often incapable of helping the soviets in this regard.

It is obvious that it will be impossible to achieve true democratization of our society's political system without overcoming these and many other shortcomings in the activity of soviets, without arming Soviet power with the rights corresponding to its responsibilities, without expanding its material potential, in other words without comprehensive and radical reform of the soviets.

The basic principles of such a comprehensive reform of the political system covering all its components, coordinated with the restructuring in the economy and in society as a whole, were discussed at the 19th party conference and reflected in its resolutions. Their direct aim is to strengthen the legislative, management, and monitoring functions of soviets, to give soviet power the right to examine and resolve all the most important questions of state, economic, social, and cultural life, and to restore the leading position of elected organs vis-a-vis executive organs and their apparatus.

Communists, soviet officials, and the whole people are studying with tremendous attention and interest the comprehensive program proposed by the conference for radical changes in the structure of soviets at all levels, the renewal and democratization of the electoral system, the demarcation of the functions of party and soviet organs, new principles in drawing up local budgets, and many other measures setting out the main avenues of Soviet power's activity in the conditions of restructuring.

This is an ambitious program for changes. Strict time limits have been set for its implementation. A report and election campaign is due to be held in party organizations already this year, based on the 19th party conference decisions on the reform of the political system and democratization of party life. The party apparatus will be reorganized by the year's end with due consideration for the division of functions between the party and the soviets. It was recommended that draft legislative acts on the restructuring of soviet organs and the necessary amendments and additions to the Constitution be examined at this fall's USSR Supreme Soviet session, and elections of USSR people's deputies be held in April next year.

At the same time it is obvious that the planned changes in the practical work and actual position of soviets cannot be accomplished automatically. They will demand tremendous efforts by those chosen by the people, by local party organs, by each Communist, and by all working people. The most important factor in this regard will probably prove to be our skill and ability to overcome a sort of psychological barrier of disbelief that everything depends on our actions, on our civic and political stance, on our labor. After all, during the personality cult period and the years of stagnation the entire bureaucratic apparatus persistently implanted in people's minds faith in the omnipotence of paperwork and taught society to think that once resolutions, decisions, and instructions have been adopted, this deletes even the most acute question from the agenda and "the problem is dealt with." Issue an appropriate document—and quality, quantity, and universal abundance will appear as if by magic, and even communism will be built in the current generation's lifetime. Nobody was allowed to express even a hint of a doubt about it, and this ultimately led directly to the alienation of working people from the administration of the state.

It was therefore logical that the 19th party conference clearly and firmly drew the conclusion: No problems can be properly resolved without the people's intellectual and moral potential, everything must be thoroughly discussed within the party and society alike, and strenuous organizational work lies ahead to implement the reforms.

Soviets have the main role to play in this regard. This work must maintain and continue the creative atmosphere, democratic standards of discussions and debates, and the businesslike and unflagging pace of the party forum.

In the first few days after the conclusion of the party conference IZVESTIYA's correspondents in different regions of the country asked conference delegates and party and soviet officials several questions about how they picture in practice the new role of soviets, about how to demarcate the functions of soviet and party organs in specific conditions, about what must be done for soviets' economic self-assertion; what procedure must be adopted for the nomination (self-nomination) of candidate deputies. The editorial office plans to publish the most interesting answers and proposals in the newspaper, but the main point—and this must be emphasized here—is that a considerable proportion of soviet and party officials are living in expectation of additional "instructions," explanations, and directives. This is an alarming sign, testifying to the habit of prolonged shilly-shallying, buck-passing, and organizing to the point where the proper time for organizing has long passed. As a matter of fact, the entire soviet system must begin work immediately, right away, taking the conference resolutions as guidelines and without waiting for circulars and instructions. This means that it is necessary to take today, right away, the first and important step in the implementation of the conference's program stipulation—to switch to soviets the center of gravity of economic, administrative, and management questions and to give the broadest possible scope to the processes of society's self-regulation and self-management and the initiative of citizens, organs of power, party and public organizations, and labor collectives.

IZVESTIYA Editorial Considers Resolution on Glasnost

*PM1907135 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Jul 88
Morning Edition p 1*

[Editorial: "The 19th Party Conference on Glasnost"; capitalization as published]

[Text] For 4 hot summer days the country could not tear itself away from its television screens when the caption "Party Conference Diary" flashed up. The next day the country would compare its impressions of what it had seen the day before with the official reports published in newspapers. People were stunned: "Did you see? EVEN THAT wasn't cut!... EVEN THAT was printed!..." It was not only the degree of frankness shown by the speakers from the rostrum at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses that was unusual but also the degree of frankness of the reports on these debates that were presented to the "masses" and to "ordinary" people.

Glasnost is, above all, TRUST, trust in the people's wisdom, common sense, and political and civic maturity. Glasnost is RESPECT for the people. Trust and respect are the main nonmaterial driving forces in our social mechanism. It is no coincidence that the conference described glasnost in all spheres of life as "one of the most important conditions for further deepening the processes of restructuring and for ensuring the irreversibility of restructuring."

In the last 3 years the very atmosphere in the country has enabled us to gain a better understanding of our past and present. In this atmosphere mighty patriotic forces are spurred on to active purposeful work for the good of the country and of socialism. It is the incorporation of glasnost into public life that has helped us profoundly and objectively assess the situation in the country with the participation of the public and collegially elaborate principled decisions to accelerate socioeconomic development and ensure the active and committed support of the working people for the CPSU's course of restructuring.

The masses must know everything, pass judgment on everything, and tackle everything consciously—this Leninist instruction is still acute and timely. The task of the day dictated by the conference is to completely democratize the process of making decisions of importance for many people, render it open, and extricate it from behind the tightly closed doors of official offices, test each project via the broadest possible discussion, and heed not only all the “pros,” but also (and even more attentively!) the “cons.” Socialist pluralism of opinions must become an effective instrument guarding our social mechanism against breakdowns and slippage. Moreover, the party—the leading force in our society, which bears particular responsibility to history—is called upon to be an example of initiative in developing glasnost.

The resolution “On Glasnost” adopted by the conference contains proposals on the openness of party forums and meetings, extensive provision of information for Communists and the population concerning the work of leading CPSU organs, local party organizations, and their committees, and the creation of a democratic mechanism for nominating leading cadres based on public opinion. It is envisaged that the members of elected party organs will receive the right to free access to sessions of the bureau accountable to them, including the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, and the right to make use of documents, information, and data at the disposal of the party committee and its apparatus. Incidentally, this is a return to the principles formulated by V.I. Lenin.

There is no doubt that all these measures will make us stronger, not weaker, and will serve to consolidate all social forces around the goals of restructuring. Glasnost, criticism, and self-criticism serve the interests of the people, reflect the openness of society's political system, and illustrate its vitality and moral health.

Glasnost is not only a growth vitamin sustaining the social organism. It can also be an extremely bitter pill and even a sharp surgeon's scalpel in those cases where criticism—an inalienable part of glasnost—comes into force. Understandably, criticism is by no means to everyone's liking. Some people want tame, domesticated, metered-out glasnost which is agreeable in every respect. But the point is that there can be no “glasnost by halves” or even “99-percent glasnost.” Even the smallest

“zone of silence” left on our political, economic, or social map very quickly grows again to global dimensions, this process is uncontrollable, and we can still remember clearly how statistics yearbooks “grew thinner” before our very eyes as more and more sections were declared “secret” and dropped.

The conference proclaimed—and this is of fundamental importance—“every citizen's inalienable right to receive on any question of public life full and authentic information—provided such information is not a state or military secret—and the right to openly and freely discuss any socially significant question.” Moreover, it did not merely proclaim this: It deemed it necessary to create legal guarantees for glasnost and to elaborate legislative acts defining the rights and obligations of the state, officials, and citizens with regard to the implementation of the principles of glasnost. The limits of necessary secrecy and official secrets must be clearly defined. A system for providing working people with constant complete information on the state of affairs—ranging from their enterprise to the country as a whole—must be created, juridically enshrining the right of citizens, public organizations, and the mass media to receive without hindrance information of interest to them. The conference demanded that unwarranted restrictions on the use of library stocks be removed, the work of archives be legislatively regulated, and that they be made accessible to researchers.

All these exceptionally important decisions are long overdue and long awaited. But, of course, it would be naive to think that glasnost can be “introduced” by a single resolution, however wonderful. Glasnost itself—the sharp weapon of restructuring—needs to be deepened and supported. Departmental and parochial barriers are still piled up in its path, it comes up against outright administrative resistance, there are still a great many people who like to settle scores with people for “criticism from below,” and attempts to express one's own opinion often still arouse grave, benighted suspicion among the adherents of “unanimity.” Haste, irresponsibility, and incompetence—the whole range of our shortcomings—are equal enemies of glasnost. We ourselves often do more harm to glasnost than any arrant bureaucrat when some of us show no effort, real knowledge, or strong mind and when we arrogate to ourselves the role of custodians of the truth and judges....

Having understood and realized this, we must today here and now, without wasting a day, implement the party conference decisions and not wait for someone to come and do this for us. “The conference calls upon all Communists and all party organizations,” the resolution “On Glasnost” says, “to speak truthfully to the masses, to actively develop socialist democratism and the culture of debate, and create favorable conditions for lively and frank discussion of any questions and for Soviet people to display initiative and creative thought.”

Some delegates criticized the press from the rostrum at the conference sharply and in extremely general terms. Of course, we would like this criticism to be more specific so that each individual case can—for the good of the cause!—be investigated to see whether this criticism is justified. All critical comments voiced at the party conference must be studied thoroughly. Journalists today realize that no one has a monopoly of truth.

"There is no restructuring or democracy without glasnost. Glasnost is the only atmosphere in which democratic, humane socialism can live and progress"—these words come from the party conference resolution. We are now learning to breathe in this atmosphere at meetings and rallies and in newspaper polemics. The result of last year's newspaper and journal subscription campaign was a true nationwide referendum in favor of glasnost: Mailmen's bags are heavier by several million copies. This shows not only a recognition of but an exacting faith in the irreversibility of the process of glasnost.

The affirmation of glasnost is in effect an affirmation of restructuring itself. "The conference views glasnost as a developing process and stresses that its consistent broadening is an invariable condition for expressing the democratic essence of the socialist system and its orientation toward man and for involving the individual in all affairs of society, state, and collective, as an effective guarantee against deformations of socialism on the basis of nationwide monitoring of the activity of all social institutions and organs of power and management."

IZVESTIYA Editorializes on Struggle Against Bureaucracy

*18000574a Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
15 Jul 88 p 1*

[Unattributed editorial: "The 19th Party Conference: On the Struggle Against Bureaucracy"]

[Text] The power of the desk—which would be an exact translation of this word from French and Latin—is not our own invention. The specific form of society's social organizations in which the executive power does not depend on a majority of their members did not make its first appearance in our country, nor did it occur yesterday. This is an ancient and international problem, humanity has been fighting it almost throughout its entire history. In various societies and in various stages differing types of bureaucracy have sprung up, just as there have been differing ideas about their role and the methods of combating them.

Our domestic bureaucrat, whom Lenin in his time called the worst internal enemy, was raised and brought up in the context of the administrative-command methods of managing the economy and the life of society as a whole. That was in fact state policy, and that is why every bureaucrat saw his own interests and those of his own department as the interests of the state.

The country's economy, managed not by economic laws, but by instructions, orders, and commands, was no longer able to exist without the bureaucrats, since economic connections were made not by commodity-money relations, but by people specifically appointed for this purpose and by those who monitored them. Administrative arbitrariness in the economy and duplication in the social and intellectual spheres facilitated the neglectful attitude toward public opinion and the social experience of the people.

The decisions of the 19th Party Conference have stated that in the atmosphere of the stagnation and the fettered condition of democratic institutions bureaucracy grew to dangerous proportions and became a drag on social development.

Today we understand clearly that with the growing influence of the bureaucracy the sovereignty of the people experienced inflation, and initiative and a creative attitude toward the cause lost their value.

The April Plenum marked the beginning of an effective assault on bureaucracy. A course was adopted toward democratization of all the spheres of our society's life, including the economic sphere. And so here now the bureaucrat, for the first time in recent decades perhaps, is feeling a real threat to his positions. His resistance today is great and not without results. Bureaucracy, that "fifth column" in the rear of the transformations, has already proven its fantastic adaptability, its ability to nullify the best plans and conceptions.

More than once in the conference the idea was uttered that the Law on the Enterprise was being neutralized by departmental instructions, that independence was being pressed down upon by the dictate of ministries, that the elective body of government was powerless before the power of the apparatus.

It is through bureaucracy, with the help of the bureaucracy, and in the interests of the bureaucracy that the main attack is being waged on restructuring, on the new course. And hardly anyone will be surprised by the fact that one of the resolutions themselves—the documents resulting from the 19th Party Conference that define the state of affairs and direction of efforts in specific spheres of our society—has been specifically devoted to the fight against bureaucracy.

One of the speeches at the conference said that bureaucracy was now the main enemy of restructuring. Moreover, that speech stated, bureaucracy begins not only with the administrative apparatus at the higher levels, it actually begins with the apparatus of the economy and goes from there up to the very top.

Few of the speeches delivered at the conference failed to mention this problem. The party official and the artist, the plant director and chairman of the agroindustrial association, the worker and the physician, all spoke

about bureaucracy with excitement and passion, with persistence and hostility. With the material of the party conference alone it would be possible to compile an encyclopedia of bureaucracy, a short one, of course, but it would reveal the utter universality and multifaceted nature of this phenomenon.

The bureaucrat sets tasks for everyone regardless of the nature and scale of their activity, and stands in the way of everyone's life and work. But what is surprising is that everyone is waging war against it, while it, all this while "in a state of war" with the entire society, has found the strength, as it gave up certain positions, to immediately capture others.

"What kind of invisible and elusive creature is this?" M. Ulyanov exclaimed from the speaker's stand at the conference. "Everyone knows about it, but no one has ever seen it. Just like some Bigfoot! Tracks—a host of them, everything trampled over, and yet no one has ever set eyes on him."

Both a very popular performer and a public figure compared bureaucrats to an evil force. We must not and indeed have no reason to fall into superstition. Decisions and laws smothering every initiative, preventing people from working at full strength, M. Ulyanov noted, are conceived by people, they have names and they hold real positions.

The speakers who came afterward received this remark as an appeal, and even the speeches resounded with "positions and names," as well as the titles of organizations and departments that personify present-day bureaucracy. Indeed, the bureaucrat is not anonymous at all. It is sufficient to call things by their right names for it to become clear that bureaucracy is a way of thinking, a method of management, and a kind of organization of production in which power is redistributed to the functionaries.

But bureaucracy is not only and not so much the functionary who has been allocated power and who is racked by a single passion: "Don't permit it!" This is above all a way of thinking and a method of acting. It is the reluctance to take responsibility on oneself, dependency, inactivity. And simply laziness, a desire to sponge on others who are producing material and nonmaterial values. And take our institutional bureaucracy, everyday bureaucracy, when for weeks we cannot obtain a trifling document, often, incidentally, concerning a trifling matter, when calling a plumber turns into a chain of humiliations. And are there only a few of our engineers and workers holding back the introduction of cost accounting in the shop, in the brigade? What do they say there: Bureaucracy resides in every one of us? That makes it strong for some reason.

So how is the fight to be waged against these self-reproducing organisms endowed with a truly fantastic ability to survive? Unless it is conquered, other victories are hardly possible.

During the discussion in the conference quite a few specific proposals were uttered on this point: from the radical "kill the authors of unnecessary papers" to the traditional appeal for order and discipline. They also included this one: expulsion from the party and dismissal from positions. There were various objections to this latter proposal: if once again hope is placed on the Central Committee removing the bureaucrat, nothing will come of it. Attempts have been made to do many things from above—without success. The bureaucrat always reaches an agreement with his superiors. The only thing he really fears is control from below, from the people, he is afraid of glasnost in our life and in all our affairs.

The resolution of the party conference defined the main directions of the fight against bureaucracy. In the economy this means unswerving observance of the law on the enterprise, the law on cooperation, observance of the powers of workers' councils, full-fledged and all-inclusive development of cost accounting relations, independence and responsibility of enterprises. In the sphere of social welfare it means greater concern for people's needs, implementation of the principle of social justice. In sociopolitical life the fight against bureaucracy has to be waged through a deepening of democracy and through development of socialist self-management.

It cannot be said that all of this was something which was not known before, but previously there was not the political opportunity for implementation of these principles. Restructuring has created this opportunity, the party conference has set it down in the form of specific decisions, at the same time deeming it necessary to create the legal conditions for strengthening the fight against bureaucracy.

The speakers at the conference said: the bureaucrat does not win with logic and better solutions, but with the force of usurped power. And the main task on this front is to take power away from the bureaucracy, which regards itself, to use Marx' expression, to be the ultimate goal of the state.

Finally, there is something else we should mention. In fighting bureaucracy we have a duty to preserve and strengthen in every way the authority of managers, to be concerned that the managerial sophistication of supervisory personnel and specialists is improved. A good manager is a talent, a rarity. We must look toward him as we do toward private property, to save him, to preserve him, and reproduce him. We have experienced too many failures from incompetence, unprofessional management at every level. A flexible apparatus that works

effectively is an instrument for restructuring. It is important here that every manager display an example of high professionalism, industry, modesty, and respect for people.

07045

IZVESTIYA Considers Concept of State Based on Law

*18000574b Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
16 Jul 88 p 1*

[Unattributed editorial: "The 19th Party Conference: On the State Based on Law"]

[Text] Restructuring is above all an exploration. An exploration of new strategies of socialist economic activity, new forms of sovereignty of the people, new methods of awakening people's initiative; it finally means a reinforcement of those relations between the state and the citizen that would afford them equal rights without detriment to the interests and dignity of either the former or the latter.

It can be boldly asserted that the high party forum—the 19th Party Conference—has made it clearly evident to us all in what kind of situation this exploration is being conducted. The words "state based on law," "supremacy of the law" were not uttered very often in the speeches of the delegates. However—and this can also be asserted—the very proceedings of the conference took place as though a law that applied equally to everyone—the presidium, the auditorium, the gallery, and the corridors—was already triumphing. The "law of the conference" determined the agenda, the rules, the outline of the discussion, that is, the most general things, which is what the law is supposed to regulate, leaving the delegates full freedom for all points of view.

In our everyday life we are at present far from the omnipotence of the law. The very term "government based on law" has come into official usage quite recently. In the Theses of the Central Committee it denoted the ultimate goal of transforming the political system of the socialist state. In the discussion that developed in the Kremlin Hall of Congresses, for reasons that are altogether clear, the juridical aspects of building the state, of a legal reform, were not discussed in detail. The conference concerned itself with the strategic directions of restructuring.

Of course, the discussion of the character of power, of the division of functions of power, of the role and powers of soviets, of the new conception of the leading role of the party, of the place of the party committee and its leader in the political system of the state—all of these things are ultimately approaches to creating a state based on law in the context of the socialist character of production and superstructural structures that have grown up on that foundation, and the one-party system.

A variant of the arrangement of political power that was advanced at the conference is very logical in the light of building a state based on law. The CPSU is the ruling party and the only party in the country. This has come about historically, and as such it is accepted by society and by the people. All the threads of power in the rayon and above have been held and are held by the party committee. Juridically it does not have any rights whatsoever. In fact it has all the rights. This discrepancy has been sanctified by time and practice, but it contradicts the very idea of a state based on law. Assumption of the burden of state power by the "first person" (of the region or of the entire country) puts everything in its place. Ideally, at least. Any decision that comes from the first person, as it passes through the democratic sieve of the deputies in the soviet, takes on the force of an official norm. At the same time, this is a decision of a government body and it is subject to verification in law—constitutional oversight. At present, we should mention, the party committee, which in actuality decides everything, is simply inaccessible to the power of law even on purely formal points: there is no oversight of any government body over an omnipotent body which has a civil status, and it is hardly possible.

This is not, of course, the only problem arising out of discussion of the reform of the political system and the reform of law at the 19th Party Conference. The conference did not provide any formulas, but it outlined the directions of explorations. It is quite obvious that a great deal of practical work lies ahead to work out the theoretical foundations of the nature of government and its legal platform. Actually, this effort began before the conference: but many articles, round-table discussions, talks, television encounters, preceding the conference seriously touched on the legal aspects only with respect to the economy. However important that foreshortening might be, by itself it is clearly not enough.

The resolution entitled "On the Legal Reform" emphasized that the legal support of restructuring is only in the very initial stage. The new principle of "everything is allowed that is not prohibited," which is not one that our practice in applied law is accustomed to, has to be conceptualized and implemented. Specific measures have been outlined to codify legislation, to strengthen the independence of the court, to improve the work of arbitration, to strengthen the procurator's oversight, and to enhance the role of the bar. At the same time, the resolution emphasizes: "Paramount attention must be paid to legal protection of the individual, there must be stronger guarantees for the exercise of the Soviet people's political, economic, and social rights and freedoms." It is quite obvious that the entire specific preparation for the legal reform must be conducted in the context of this thesis contained in the resolution.

It must be said that as a result of restructuring and the overall democratization of our life there has been a great deal of movement in justice as well. For example, there have been acquittals: a phenomenon normal for judicial

practice which for long years was considered practically a ruination of its foundations; "law accomplished over the telephone" is disappearing, even if haltingly; in the Ministry of Internal Affairs investigation and the police are becoming parallel branches which are not dependent on one another; law enforcement agencies are operating under the new system in a number of republics and oblasts. Of course, this is only the beginning, the first steps. The resolution entitled "On the Legal Reform" gives restructuring in law enforcement agencies a certain clarity and outlines the pathways of the exploration.

There is no doubt that juridical institutions, government agencies, public organizations, lawyers, and journalists will undertake to work out the conception of the state based on law and all its components. But still it is very important that citizens at all levels of education and social position do not stand aloof from discussion of the problems that concern everyone. People must at least get a clear understanding of the nature of the problems that are hidden behind the phrases and legalese. That is why universal legal education is so important. Indeed, we need simple enlightenment: information about legislation in effect, clarification of the norms of the civil and criminal law, and the state enactments that have the force of law. But universal legal education is also called upon to prepare people for discussion of the most important pieces of proposed legislation. And these discussions lie ahead of us—on solving the unresolved issues of the state and the law. We will be frank: constitutional law, the theory of the state, the history of democratic institutions, the guiding principle from the ancient Greeks, the experience of government of other countries and peoples, even if that experience is considered "not something we need," all of this is hidden behind seven seals for many of us. Will we reject the purely classical principle of division of "three powers" or again look to its constructive aspects; will we be inclined to the form of a court of barristers or to improve the existing judicial arrangement—there is a great deal to think about here. And the citizen of our country has the right to look on all of this with open eyes: to know about everything so as to be able to evaluate and make his choice, and that ultimately will become the people's choice.

It has to be admitted, the legal awareness of our population is at present at a level that leaves much to be desired. The years of repression have taken their toll,

especially the stagnation, its hypocrisy, the selective way in which the law was applied, and the subordination of the law to instructions and commands. This applies not only to the business of the courts and the operation of procurators' offices and the police. Unlawful voluntarism prevailed in production, infringing the rights of citizens in their everyday life and in their relations with official government bodies and managerial authorities. All of this could not but have an effect on the level of legal awareness.

The cooperatives are coming into our life—they have been given a rather reliable legal foundation. But the lease and the family contract, truck gardening and fruit-growing, and other forms of work that arouse initiative are in need of clear legislative support designed for the long run. Many articles in the USSR Constitution are still declarations that have no legal machinery capable of implementing them and enforcing them in practice. So that improvement of legislative activity, which the resolution speaks about, and its democratization are becoming an urgent necessity of the first order.

The party was the initiator of restructuring. At the conference that has taken place it confirmed in deeds its determination to take the democratization of society all the way; it proclaimed the need to create a socialist state based on law, openly declaring that the power of the ruling party is unthinkable except through the laws of the state.

M.S. Gorbachev confirmed these principles in the speech he delivered to close the conference, saying that "the party must irrecoverably renounce the methods based on issuing commands and orders and conduct its policy through its organizational, personnel, and ideological effort in the context of the strictest enforcement of Soviet laws and democratic principles in social life."

So, the principles have been proclaimed, the architectural design is being crystallized, the time is coming to erect the walls of the house we share—the state, in which leading figures and a people endowed with full rights, authoritative government, and an inexorable law must take their equal places. The construction project will not be completed soon, but it is time even now to be building.

07045